

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXIII

JULY 1938

Number 3

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS AND THE PERIPATETIC MEAN OF STYLE

S. F. BONNER

IN HIS well-known article, "The Peripatetic Mean of Style and the Three Stylistic Characters" (*AJP*, XXV [1904], 125–46), Professor G. L. Hendrickson has clearly shown that the fundamental idea underlying Aristotle's treatment of style in the third book of his *Rhetoric* is that of the observance of the Mean (*μεσότης, τὸ μέσον, τὸ μέτρον*). He rightly points out that not only in his definition of style but also in his discussion of diction and prose rhythm Aristotle constantly reverts to the Mean as his criterion; and it may be added that the same is true of his treatment of the topic of humor in chapter x of the book.¹ There are also, as Hendrickson proceeds to show, strong grounds for believing that Theophrastus followed his master in stressing the importance of this principle, which became the most characteristic feature of Peripatetic stylistic doctrine. It is the aim of the present article to take the study one stage farther, and to trace the operation of the principle of the Mean in the *Scripta rhetorica* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, whose indebtedness to the Peripatetic

¹ The extremes are (i) superficial jests, obvious to everyone (*τὰ ἐπιπόλαια . . . παντὶ δῆλα*), and (ii) obscure, unintelligible sayings (*δσα εἰρημένα ἀγνοούμενα κατι*), and the Mean is represented by (iii) lively remarks, the point of which becomes quickly, if not immediately, clear (*δσων η ὅμα λεγομένων η γνῶσις γίνεται . . . η μικρὸν ὑστερίζει η διένοια*).

school, often remarked upon,² but occasionally contested,³ should thus be more securely established.

It will be convenient to deal with the subject under two heads and to observe this influence (1) directly, in Dionysius' theory of diction, composition, and the three types of style, and (2) indirectly, in his criticisms of individual authors, which are frequently the practical outcome of that theory.

Aristotle's view of diction, briefly, is that the restriction of the vocabulary to ordinary, current words is one extreme, and that the unrestrained use of poetical vocabulary is the other. The ideal is to vary the language of ordinary conversation with occasional striking and unusual words, and particularly with metaphors; for an air of distinction is thus imparted to the style, which then becomes neither *ταπεινή* nor *ὑπέρ τὸ ἀξίωμα* but *πρέποντα* (*Rhet.* iii. 2. 1-3).⁴

Theophrastus, also, appears to have considered the faults of diction to lie in deficiency and excess of the just measure. For him one extreme was frigidity, which resulted from the inappropriate use of high-sounding words (cf. Demetrius *περὶ ἐρμηνείας* §114: *ὅριζεται δὲ τὸ ψυχρὸν Θεόφραστος οὕτως· ψυχρόν ἔστι τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τὴν οἰκείαν ἀπαγγελίαν*). Hendrickson (*op. cit.*, p. 141) considers that this was the only extreme designated by Theophrastus, but it has been strongly argued⁵ that he also regarded aridity (*τὸ ξηρόν*, resulting from the sole use of common words) as the opposite extreme. Such a reconstruction (based on Demetrius *π. ἐρμ.* § 237) would of course bring Theophrastus directly into line with Aristotle.

Dionysius closely adheres to the Peripatetic tradition; he censures Gorgias for his excessive indulgence in poetical expression (*De Lysia*

² G. Mestwerdt, *De D. H. in libro de comp. verb. studiis* (Göttingen, 1868), p. 19; G. Ammon, *De D. H. librorum rhetoricon fontibus* (Munich, 1889), pp. 16, 17, 27, 48, 72, 75, etc.; L. Radermacher, *Rhein. Mus.*, LIV (1899), 374 ff.; W. Kroll, *Rhein. Mus.*, LXII (1907), 91 ff.; W. Rhys Roberts, Introd. to ed. of *De comp. verb.* (London, 1910), p. 48. None of these scholars, however, approaches the question from the present angle.

³ C. N. Smiley, *Latinitas and 'Ελληνισμός* (University of Wisconsin Bull. [Madison, 1906]), chap. ii, where Stoic influence on Dionysius is, in my opinion, considerably overestimated.

⁴ Cf. J. F. D'Alton, *Roman Literary Criticism* (London, 1931), p. 87, for further remarks.

⁵ By J. Stroux, in his excellent study *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 107, to which the reader is referred for fuller discussion.

3 = I, 10, l. 13)⁶ but is far from being satisfied merely with those virtues which spring from the use of common words (cf. his remarks on the shortcomings of Lysias, *ibid.* 13 = I, 23, l. 5). He describes as follows, in terms which immediately suggest Peripatetic influence, the style which he regards as most fitting for a historian: ἐγώ δὲ οὕτε αὐχμηρὰν καὶ ἀκόσμητον καὶ ιδιωτικὴν τὴν ιστορικὴν εἶναι πραγματείαν ἀξιώσαυμ' ἄν, ἀλλ' ἔχουσάν τι καὶ ποιητικόν οὕτε παντάπασι ποιητικήν, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ὅλιγον ἐκβεβηκύναν τῆς ἐν ἔθει· ἀνιαρόν γάρ οἱ κόρος καὶ τῶν πάνυ ήδεων, ηδὲ συμμετρίᾳ πανταχῇ χρήσιμον (*De Thuc.* 51 = I, 411, l. 7; cf. *ibid.* 49 = I, 408, l. 5: ηδὲ συμμετρίᾳ ως ἐκβεβηκύνα τὰ συνήθη; also *ibid.* 54 = I, 414, l. 9, and p. 415, l. 6). His careful observation of the Mean appears also in his remarks on the employment of strange or compound words; he regards τὸ ἐν φῷ δεῖ τρόπῳ τὰ ξένα καὶ πεποιημένα λέγεσθαι καὶ μέχρι πόσου προελθόντα πεπαῦσθαι as 'καλὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖ θεωρήματα ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις' (*De Thuc.* 24 = I, 363, l. 23; cf. *ibid.* 35 = I, 383, l. 9). Finally, his praise of the early λογογράφοι for their moderation in the use of figurative expression is a clear, though possibly unconscious, reminiscence of Aristotle's criticism of the corresponding fault in Aleidamas (cf. *ibid.* 23 = I, 359, l. 22, περὶ τὴν κυρίαν λέξιν μᾶλλον ἐσπούδασαν ηδὲ περὶ τὴν τροπικὴν, ταύτην δὲ ὡς σπέρη ηδὺ συμματεῖται παρελάμβανον, with *Rhet.* III. 3. 3, οὐ γάρ ηδύ συμματεῖται χρῆται ἀλλ' ὡς ἐδέσματι τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις).

In the sphere of composition the similarities of outlook are equally pronounced. Aristotle's remarks on prose rhythm are again built up on the principle of the Mean: *τὸ δὲ σχῆμα τῆς λέξεως δεῖ μήτε ἔμμετρον εἶναι μήτε ἄρρυθμον ῥύθμῳ δεῖ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον, μέτρον δὲ μήποιῆμα γάρ ἔσται· ῥύθμῳ δὲ μὴ ἀκριβῶς· τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται ἐὰν μέχρι του ή* (*Rhet.* iii. 8. 1-3; cf. Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 130). His views were subsequently adopted and developed by Theophrastus, as is clear from Cicero *Orator* 173: “[Aristoteles] versum in oratione vetat esse, numerum iubet Theophrastus vero iisdem de rebus etiam accuratius.” Their position is taken up by Dionysius, who says: *πᾶσα λέξις ἡ δίχα μέτρον συγκειμένη ποιητικὴν μούσαν ἡ μελικὴν χάριν οὐ δύναται προσλαβεῖν οὐ μέντοι προσήκει γε ἔμμετρον οὐδὲ ἔρρυθμον αὐτὴν* (*sc. τὴν ψιλὴν λέξιν*) *εἶναι δοκεῖν (ποίημα γάρ οὕτως ἔσται καὶ μέλος.*

⁶ References to Dionysius are to the volume, page, and line of the Teubner text by Usener-Rädermacher (2 vols.; Leipzig, 1899-1929).

ἐκβήσεται τε ἀπλῶς τὸν αὐτῆς χαρακτῆρα, ἀλλ' εὔρυθμον αὐτὴν ἀπόχρη
καὶ εὔμετρον φάίνεσθαι μόνον κ.τ.λ. (*De comp. verb.* 25 = II, 125, l. 2; cf. Roberts, *ad loc.*). These words are shortly followed by an explicit reference to the third book of the *Rhetic*.

From his study of rhythm Aristotle passes by a natural transition to the period; it can hardly be argued (despite Hendrickson, p. 131), however, that in his treatment of periodic structure generally Aristotle takes up an intermediate position. He simply distinguishes between the loose, concatenated style (*λέξις εἰρομένη*), which is ἀηδὲς διὰ τὸ ἄπειρον, and the periodic style (*λέξις κατεστραμμένη*), which wins his full approval (*Rhet.* iii. 9. 1 ff.). However, if we may believe (with Hendrickson, p. 132, who compares Cicero *De oratore* iii. 184) that Demetrius π. ἐρμ. 15 represents once more the doctrine of Theophrastus, we find an interesting development of Aristotle's remarks. Demetrius (i.e., probably Theophrastus) says: δοκιμάζω γὰρ δὴ ἔγωγε μήτε περιόδοις ὅλον τὸν λόγον συνείρεσθαι, ὡς τοῦ Γοργίου, μήτε διαλελύσθαι ὅλον ὡς τὰ ἀρχαῖα, ἀλλὰ μὲ μῆχθαὶ μᾶλλον δι' ἀμφοτέρων. The last phrase represents the true doctrine of the Mean, and it is interesting now to add that Dionysius implies acceptance of this point of view in *De comp. verb.* 9 = II, 36, line 1, and Roberts, *op. cit.*, page 118: οὐ γὰρ δὴ πανταχῇ γε τὸ ἐμπερίοδον χρήσιμον. καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ θεώρημα τῆς συνθετικῆς ἐπιστήμης ἴδιον, πότε δὲν χρῆσθαι περιόδοις καὶ μέχρι πόσον καὶ πότε μή. So much for periodic structure in general; with regard to the individual period and its parts, Aristotle expresses himself in language that clearly recalls the idea of the Mean. The period should be εὐανάπνευστος and its clauses of moderate length: δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ κῶλα καὶ τὰς περιόδους μήτε μυούρους εἶναι μήτε μακράς (*Rhet.* iii. 9. 5-6). This doctrine appears again (probably through the medium of Theophrastus or later Peripatetics) in the early sections of Demetrius (esp. § 4),⁷ and it is clearly remarked in Dionysius, who points out that in the smooth, periodic type of composition the length of the period and its component parts is carefully measured and limited: δρίζοντα κώλου τε μῆκος, δι μὴ βραχύτερον ἔσται μηδὲ μεῖζον τοῦ μετρίου, καὶ περιόδου μέτρον, οὐ πνεῦμα τέλειον ἀνδρὸς κρατήσει (*De comp. verb.* 23 = II, 113, l. 2, and Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 234).

⁷ Cf. F. Solmsen "Demetrios περὶ ἐρμηνείας und sein peripatetisches Quellenmaterial," *Hermes*, LXVI (1931), 241-67 (esp. p. 254).

Finally, in his decision concerning the best "type" of composition, Dionysius is in clear agreement with the Aristotelian point of view. He gives neither of the two extremes, the austere (*αὐστηρά*) and the smooth (*γλαφυρά*), his full approval, but reserves his praise for the middle type, which he describes in terms expressly designed to recall the Peripatetic *μεσότης*: *ἡ δὲ τρίτη καὶ μέση τῶν εἰρημένων δνεῖν ἀρμονῶν, ἦν εὐκρατὸν καλῶ . . . δοκεῖ μοι τὰ πρωτεῖα ἐπιτηδεία εἶναι φέρεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ μεσότης μέν τις ἐστι (μεσότης δὲ ἡ ἀρετὴ καὶ βίων καὶ ἔργων, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλει τε δοκεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσοι κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν αἰρεσιν φιλοσοφοῦντειν) . . . κ.τ.λ.* (*De comp. verb.* 24 = II, 120, l. 11; Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 246). The addition of the article in the passage in parentheses (*ἡ ἀρετὴ*) shows clearly that the principle of the Mean far outweighed other considerations in the critic's mind.⁸

That Dionysius thus sets forth the middle type of composition "in terms which are drawn from the Aristotelian conception of style in general" Hendrickson admits (*op. cit.*, pp. 136 and 146; cf. Stroux, *op. cit.*, p. 111); but he holds a different opinion concerning Dionysius' treatment of the middle type of style. After remarking that Dionysius alone of our authorities considers the middle style the most admirable, he adds (p. 143): "On closer examination it will be found that his conception bears only a crude external resemblance to the Peripatetic idea of the Mean." His argument in support is that, for Dionysius, "there are but two fundamental styles, the simple and the grand, and the excellence of the *μέσος* consists in the fact that by combining the two the range of style is increased." With this view I cannot agree, for Dionysius' remarks on the middle *ἀρμονία* (*De comp. verb.* 24, partially quoted above) and on the middle type of style (*De Dem.* 3 = I, 132, l. 3) are couched in strikingly similar terms; if therefore with Hendrickson we admit the one to represent the true Peripatetic conception, then we must also admit the other.⁹ The middle *ἀρμονία*

⁸ The point is not well brought out in Rhys Roberts' translation.

⁹ For an implied acknowledgment of this fact see J. D. Meerwaldt, *De Dionysiana virtutum et generum dicendi doctrina* ("Studia ad generum dicendi historiam pertinentia," Pars I [Amsterdam, 1920]), pp. 46 ff. Meerwaldt also rightly observes that the middle style, like the middle *ἀρμονία*, is not intended by Dionysius to be a rigid category (cf. p. 49): "Consentaneum est mediocritatis notionem pariter definitam parique laude cumulatam ibi quoque (*sc.* in medio genere dicendi) varios atque decoros gradus admettere."

is *μέση τῶν εἰρημένων δυεῖν*, and is *εὐκρατος*; the middle style is likewise *μικτή τε καὶ σύνθετος ἐκ τούτων τῶν δυεῖν*. The middle *ἀρμονία*, more explicitly, *κεκέρασται πως*¹⁰ ἐξ ἑκείνων μετρίως καὶ ἔστιν ἐκλογή τις τῶν ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ κρατίστων; the middle style also *κέκραται εὖ πως καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ χρήσιμον εὐληφεν ἑκατέρας*. The middle *ἀρμονία* is admirable simply because it is a Mean (*ἐπειδὴ μεσότης ἔστι κ.τ.λ.*); the middle style likewise *αὐτὴν τὴν προαιρεσιν ἔσικεν ἔχειν σπουδῆς ἀξίαν*. There is here no divergence but an exact correspondence of view. Hendrickson's argument seems to go astray when he assumes that Dionysius thought of the middle style as merely a combination of the other two; this is inaccurate and oversimplifies the matter. The extreme styles are for Dionysius equally imperfect; cf. *De Dem.* 2 = I, 131, l. 18: *δύο μὲν δὴ χαρακτῆρες οὗτοι λέξεως, τοσούτοις ἀλλήλων διάφοροι κατὰ τὰς ἀγωγὰς, καὶ ἄνδρες οἱ πρωτεύσαντες ἐν αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲ διεξῆλθον, δεινοὶ μὲν ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶν ἔργοις ἀμφότεροι, καθ' ὃ δὲ ἵστοι ἀλλήλων ἥσαν, ἀ τε λειτέστεροι*.¹¹ The middle style is formed not by combination but by a process of selection of the best points in the two extremes (*αὐτὸ τὸ χρήσιμον εὐληφεν ἑκατέρας*) and avoidance of the excesses (cf. *ibid.* 15 = I, 161, l. 24): *διὰ ταῦτα ἐγώ τὴν οὕτως κατεσκευασμένην λέξιν μετριωτάτην ἔνιατι τῶν ἄλλων νενόμικα καὶ τῶν λόγων τούτους μάλιστα ἀποδέχομαι τοὺς πεφευγότας ἑκατέρου τῶν χαρακτήρων τὰς ὑπερβολὰς.*¹² The development from Aristotle is a quite understandable one. Aristotle's view that style must be neither *ταπεινή* nor *ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα* but *πρέπουσα* implies that the extremes, though they have not yet become crystallized into types, are nevertheless bad. Dionysius (and intermediate theorists), analyzing

¹⁰ Usener-Radermacher, II, 120, l. 14, read ὡς with EF; πως, the reading of PMV, is adopted by Roberts and defended by Stroux, *op. cit.*, p. 111, n. 2.

¹¹ I take the last phrase to mean that they were like each other in that they were both imperfect. Hendrickson's interpretation (p. 143), "so far as the one approaches the other it loses something of its complete perfection," seems to me to be a doubtful rendering and also to miss the real point.

¹² Stroux (*op. cit.*, p. 111, n. 3) considers that Dionysius in his definition of the *μέσην ἀρμονίαν* (*De comp. verb.* 24) confuses the two ideas of combination and selection; if this were so, we should also have to consider it true of Dionysius' definition of the middle style. But (i) it is important to notice that in *De Dem.* 36 extr. = I, 209, l. 9, also chap. 41 = I, 220, ll. 1 and 20, Dionysius definitely decides that the *μέσην ἀρμονίαν* is formed by a process of selection; and these are later utterances (cf. the explicit references to the *De comp. verb.* in *De Dem.* 49 and 50). (ii) In any case, may not a selection of the best points from two extremes be said, without incompatibility, to be "a sort of mixture" (*κεκέρασται πως*) of those extremes?

the extremes further, and formulating types, must have seen that the vices in the extremes were but virtues pushed to excess, and that even in a style that was *ταπεινή* there were certain good qualities such as correctness, accuracy, lucidity; while in a style that was admittedly *ὑπέρ τὸ ἀξιωμα* there was often grandeur, impressiveness, power. Aristotle had argued, "Avoid the vice"; Dionysius adds, "And select the virtue" inherent in the two extremes; but the principle of the Mean strongly influences his conception of the middle style.

So far attention has been drawn only to the influence of this principle on Dionysius' theory; it remains to illustrate its application in his criticisms of individual prose writers. The authors whom he often, though by no means always, criticizes adversely are four: Gorgias, Thucydides, Plato, and Isocrates; and as "faulty writing errs chiefly on the side of excess" (Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 142; cf. Cicero *Orator* 73, "magis offendit nimium quam parum") so it is to some excess in the style of each that the critic objects. In doing so he makes particular use of the phrase *τὸ μέτριον*, which can be none other than the Peripatetic Mean, applied in a more general sense.

Gorgias, first, is censured for an immoderate use of poetical vocabulary and figures of speech: *De Isaeo* 19 = I, 121, l. 22: *Γοργίαν μὲν τὸν Λεοντίνον ἐκ πι πτοντα τοῦ μετρίου καὶ πολλαχοῦ παιδαριώδη γυγνόμενον δρῶν*; *De Dem.* 4 = I, 135, l. 19: *τὰ γὰρ ἀντιθετά τε καὶ πάρισα καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια τούτοις οὔτε μετρία σον τα οὐτ' ἐν καιρῷ γυγνόμενα καταισχύνει τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν αὐτῆς* (of the style of Isocrates when he imitates Gorgias; criticism of Gorgias is indirect but clearly implied); *De Thuc.* 24 = I, 363, l. 1: *ἀντιθέσεις, ἐν αἷς ἐπλεόνασε Γοργίας δὲ Λεοντίνος* (cf. *De Lysia* 3 = I, 10, l. 13). It is perhaps worthy of notice here, in view of what has been said above (p. 261) concerning the three types of style, that Dionysius acknowledges that there is grandeur, dignity, and elegance in Gorgias' style: *De Dem.* 4 = I, 135, l. 10, *τῆς δὲ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Γοργίου (sc. λέξεως) τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ σεμνότητα καὶ καλλιλογίαν εἴληφε (sc. ἡ τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους λέξις)*. That is to say, he finds virtues in it despite the fact that it is an extreme.

Thucydides is judged in a similar manner; one of his most striking characteristics, according to Dionysius, is his constant striving after innovation in expression, which frequently results in obscurity. It is

not so much the obscurity, serious fault though that is, that incurs censure as the immoderate use of poetical diction and brief, contorted phraseology, which is the underlying cause. The following passages make this clear: *De Thuc.* 51 = I, 411, l. 3, ὅταν μὲν οὖν τεταμιευμένως αὐτῇ (sc. τῇ ἐξηλλαγμένῃ λέξει) χρήσται καὶ μετρίως, θαυμαστός ἔστι καὶ οὐδενὶ συγκριτός ἐτέρῳ· ὅταν δὲ κατακόρως καὶ ἀπειροκάλως, μήτε τοὺς καιροὺς διορίζων μήτε τὴν ποσθετή ταδρόν, μεμπτός; *ibid.* 47 = I, 404, l. 22 (admirable passages are those) ὅσα τὰς τε ἔξαλλαγὰς τῶν ὄνομάτων καὶ τῶν σχημάτων μετρίας ἔχει καὶ οὕτε περιέργους οὕτε δυσπαρακολουθήτους; *De Dem.* 10 = I, 148, l. 6 (Thueydides and Demosthenes differ), οὐχὶ τῷ ποιῷ μὰ Δίᾳ . . . τῷ δὲ ποσῷ καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον τοῖς καιροῖς. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀταμεύτως τῇ κατασκευῇ κέχρηται καὶ ἄγεται μᾶλλον ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἡ *(αὐτὸς)* ἄγει καθ' ὃ ἡ μὲν ἡ μετρία τῆς ἔξαλλαγῆς ἀσαφῆ ποιεῖ τὴν λέξιν αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ μὴ κρατεῖν τῶν καιρῶν ἀηδῆ· ὁ δὲ ῥήτωρ τοῦ τε ἀρκοῦν τοις στοχάζεται κ.τ.λ.; *De Thuc.*, chap 36 = I, 384, l. 2 (praiseworthy speeches of Thueydides are) τοῖς [*τε*] προσώποις καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν οἰκείοις καὶ μήτ' ἐλλείποντας τοῦ μετρίου μήτε νπεραίροντας.¹³

Plato's style likewise, in the critic's opinion, is far less successful when he fails to exercise restraint and employs poetical embellishment and high-sounding phrases beyond reasonable measure. *De Dem.* 5 = I, 137, l. 7: ὅταν δὲ εἰς τὴν περιπτολογίαν καὶ τὸ καλλιεπέν, ὁ πολλάκις εἴωθε ποιεῖν, ἢ μετρον ὅρμην λάβη, πολλῷ χείρων ἐαυτῆς γίνεται; cf. *ibid.*, I, 138, l. 1: ἀλληγορίας τε περιβάλλεται πολλὰς *(καὶ μακρὰς)*, οὕτε μέτρον ἐχούσας οὕτε καιρόν; and esp. *Ep. ad Romp.* 2 = II, 230, l. 13: ἐν γάρ τούτοις τὸ μὲν πραγματικὸν οὐδαμῆ μέμφομαι τοῦ ἀνδρός, τοῦ δὲ λεκτικοῦ μορίου τὸ περὶ τὴν τροπικήν τε καὶ διθυραμβικὴν φράσιν ἐκπίπτον, ἐν οἷς οὐ κρατεῖ τοῦ μετρίου.

Lastly, Isocrates, like his predecessor Gorgias, is criticized on the grounds of excessive employment of parallelism and antithesis; his work is, in fact, "one long antithesis" (*De Dem.* 20 = I, 171, l. 15). It is curious that Aristotle, to whom such a style appealed as ἡδεῖα (as he himself says after quoting several instances from the *Panegyri-*

¹³ On this doctrine of propriety to speaker and subject see *De Lysia* 9 = I, 16, l. 17 (cited by Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 146, as expressing the true Peripatetic conception).

cus [*Rhet.* iii. 9. §§ 7–8]), should not have remarked that it was also capable of being driven to excess. It may well be conjectured that Isocrates' style did not find favor in the eyes of Theophrastus, for Dionysius expressly informs us that in his *περὶ λέξεως* he censured writers who were fond of such figures (*De Lysia* 14 = I, 23, l. 19). Dionysius further informs us (*De Isocrate* 13 = I, 73, l. 5) that a later Peripatetic, Hieronymus, passed a definitely unfavorable opinion on the style of Isocrates because of its lack of the power to stir. The following criticisms of Dionysius suggest that he was not merely in accord with the later Peripatetic tradition in condemning the style of Isocrates but was, furthermore, doing so by the application of their own principle of the Mean: *De Isoc.* 3 = I, 58, l. 10: *σχηματίζει τε φορτικῶς καὶ τὰ πολλὰ γίνεται ψυχρὸς ἢ τῷ πόρρωθεν λαμβάνειν ἢ τῷ μὴ πρέποντα εἶναι τὰ σχήματα τοῖς πράγμασι διὰ τὸ μὴ κρατεῖν τοῦ μετρίου*; *ibid.* 13 = I, 74, l. 1: *καὶ οὐ τὸ γένος μέμφομαι τῶν σχημάτων (πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἔχρησαντο καὶ συγγραφεῖς καὶ ρήτορες, ἀνθίσαι βουλόμενοι τὴν λέξιν), ἀλλὰ τὸν πλεονασμὸν (cf. *ibid.* 14 *passim*, and esp. I, 75, l. 9: εἰ μέτροις εἴη μέχρι δεῦρο, ἀνεκτός, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἀνήσει); De Dem.* 21 = I, 176, l. 3 (the style of Demosthenes is superior because) *πέφευγε τὰ ψυχρὰ καὶ μειρακιώδη σχήματα, οἷς ἐκείνη (sc. ἡ τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους λέξις) καλλωπίζεται πέρα τοῦ μετρίου. Ibid.* 18 = I, 166, l. 8: *στοχαζομένη γὰρ τοῦ σαφοῦς ὀλιγωρεῖ πολλάκις τοῦ μετρίου.*

Briefly summarized, Dionysius' classification of the authors whom he criticizes is as follows: Gorgias and Thucydides represent the grand style (*De Dem.* 1) but are far from winning an unqualified approval. Lysias, on the other hand, is the best exponent of the plain style (*ibid.* 2), but his deficiencies are clearly expressed (*De Lysia* 13). Plato and Isocrates are viewed as intermediate, and represent the middle style (*De Dem.* 3); they, however, left the style imperfect (*ἀτελές [ibid. 14 = I, 158, l. 15]*). Demosthenes is the consummate prose artist, and his style is characterized not as either of the extremes (*τὰς ἀκρότητας [ibid. 2 = I, 130, l. 23]*) but as the perfection of the Middle (*ibid.* 14 and 15)—that is, *τοῦ μέσου καὶ κρατίστου χαρακτῆρος* (I, 203, l. 18).¹⁴

Two final quotations, which do not come under any technical head-

¹⁴ Cf. *De imitatione* ii, 2 = II, 206, l. 21, on Euripides.

ing, may serve to suggest that the idea of the Mean impressed itself so strongly on Dionysius' mind as to become almost a habit of thought. The first of these is taken from the latter part of the *De Demosthene* (55 = I, 248, l. 18), where Dionysius is concerned to refute the charge of Aeschines that Demosthenes employed *πικροῖς καὶ περιέργοις ὄνδρασι*. His reply is as follows: *εἰ μὲν οὖν μὴ κατὰ τὸν οἰκεῖον καιρὸν τῇ πικραινούσῃ διαλέκτῳ χρώμενον ἀπεδείκνυεν αὐτὸν ἢ πλεονάξοντα ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τῆς ποσότητος ἀστοχοῦντα, εἰκότως ἂν ὡς ἀμαρτάνοντα διέβαλλεν.* ὃ δὲ τούτων μὲν οὐδέτερον ἔχει δεικνύναι κ.τ.λ. The second is of a more general nature still and can only claim to have any weight if considered in conjunction with the many passages already cited. It is taken from Dionysius' discussion of the *ἀντηρὰ ἀρμονία* (*De comp. verb.* 22 = II, 98, l. 19, and Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 214); he recognizes herein the possibility of saying either too much or too little, and expresses his eagerness to strike the Mean in the words *ἔδει δέ πως τὸ μέτριον ἀμφοῖν λαβεῖν καὶ μήτε πλεονάσαι τοῦ καιροῦ μήτ' ἐλλιπεῖν τῆς πίστεως.*

If the evidence, then, be taken as a whole, it would seem hard to deny that there is in the *Scripta rhetorica* a strong underrunnt of Peripatetic thought; and this opinion is supported by the fact that both Aristotle and Theophrastus are specifically referred to as authorities on several occasions.¹⁵ Dionysius was wise in returning to them; writing, as he did, when the maze of formal rhetoric was becoming ever more intricate, he could hardly have done better than be guided by pioneers who had not forgotten to apply to the criticism of style the ancient principle of *Μηδὲν ἄγαν*.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

¹⁵ For references see the *Index locorum* appended to Vol. II of Usener-Radermacher's edition, esp. s.v. "Theophrastus."

THE UNNAMED CHARACTERS IN THE PLAYS OF PLAUTUS

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH

THE names of the characters in the comedies of Plautus have been carefully studied,¹ and there has been considerable discussion concerning the correct name that should be assigned to many of the characters. This problem has arisen particularly in connection with the study of the scene-headings of the Plautine manuscripts,² for certain characters are named in the scene-headings, but not in the text. There are also many characters for whom no names are found either in the scene-headings or in the text. The latter group has been less thoroughly examined but is no less important if we wish to discover what the normal practice of Plautus was in the naming of his characters. In a brief discussion of the instances in which characters have no personal names throughout the play,³ Key accepts Lindsay's view that Plautus originally gave names to all his more important characters,⁴ and says: "A few characters are unnamed in Plautus." This statement is misleading for it gives the impression that the unnamed characters are comparatively rare. Of the approximately two hundred and twenty characters in the twenty plays of Plautus,⁵

¹ Cf. F. Ritschl, "Quaestiones onomatologicae comicae," in *Opuscula Philologica* (Leipzig, 1877), III, 301-51; K. Schmidt, "Die griechischen Personennamen bei Plautus," *Herm.*, XXXVII (1902), 173-211, 353-90, 608-26; F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen* (2d ed.; Berlin, 1912), 107-10; B. L. Ullman, "Proper Names in Plautus, Terence, and Menander," *Class. Phil.*, XI (1916), 61-64.

² Cf. H. W. Prescott, "The Scene-Headings in the Early Recensions of Plautus," *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.*, IX (1898), 102-8; W. M. Lindsay, *The Ancient Editions of Plautus* (Oxford, 1904), 88-104.

³ D. M. Key, *The Introduction of Characters by Name in Greek and Roman Comedy* (Chicago, 1923), 80-82.

⁴ Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

⁵ The total number of characters can only be approximate, as we do not know the number of actors in certain groups of unnamed characters, e.g., the *advocati* (*Poen.*) and the *piscatores* (*Rud.*). I list such character groups, therefore, as individual characters. Furthermore, I exclude from the total given above the numerous slaves, attendants, etc., who speak no lines and have no real part in the action of the play, e.g., the attendants in the *Amphitruo* (cf. 854), the *adulescentes* in the *Rudens* (cf. 89, 157), the *ancillae* in the *Truculentus* (cf. 530 ff.). For a detailed analysis of these silent supernumeraries see H. W. Prescott, "Silent Rôles in Comedy," *Class. Phil.*, XXXI (1936), 98-119.

there are thirty that are unnamed in both text and scene-headings. In addition to these, there are nine, possibly ten, characters who are named in the scene-headings but not in the text as it now exists.⁶ From the standpoint of the audience, these characters too had no names, and so they must be included among the unnamed characters. This brings the total of characters to whom no names are assigned throughout the play to thirty-nine or forty, or almost 18 per cent of the total number of characters.⁷

The existence of so considerable a number of characters whose names do not occur in the text makes it difficult to believe that Plautus originally named all his characters and that so many names could have been lost from the text of the plays. On the other hand, if we admit the possibility that originally no names were given to certain characters by Plautus, are we to limit this group, as Lindsay does, to characters who are of little importance in the action of the play? Must we assume that Plautus assigned a name to each of his leading characters?

It is true that most of the important characters are named in the text. The audience learns the name of the character either when he introduces himself, when he is directly addressed by another actor, or when he is mentioned during his absence,⁸ and in many instances the name occurs in the text with great frequency.⁹ The characters of certain roles, such as the *adulescentes*, *meretrices*, and *lenones*, are always named. In the case of the *servi*, *senes*, *milites*, and *matronae*, approximately five-sixths of each group have names, while for the *puellae*, *parasiti*, and *ancillae*, names are given to three-fourths of each group. When we come to less important roles, such as the *pueri*, *coqui*, and *lorarii*, the proportion of unnamed characters is considerably higher.

⁶ We must, of course, admit the possibility that in some instances the names may have been lost from the text (cf. below, pp. 275 ff.). In most cases, however, there is no indication that the name ever appeared in the text.

⁷ The proportion of unnamed characters might be slightly increased by the addition of the problematical *amicus patris Alcesimarchi* (cf. *Cist.* 267), and of a possible *servus Lyconidis* in *Aul.* IV, 1 ff. as distinct from the Strobilus of II, 4, 5, and 6 (see below, p. 272, n. 23).

⁸ Cf. Key, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 ff., 64 ff., 73 f., for a discussion of the manner in which characters are introduced by name.

⁹ The following characters are mentioned by name in the text more than thirty times: Chrysalus (*Bacch.*), Epidieus, Mnesilochus (*Bacch.*), Philocomasium (*Mil. gl.*), Philolaches (*Most.*), and Pseudolus.

It is clear, therefore, that a majority of the characters of the more important roles is named by Plautus. But how important are the unnamed characters? Are they invariably inorganic characters,¹⁰ or are some of them essential to the action of the drama?

The characters of Plautine comedy may be classified in three groups: (1) incidental characters of no practical importance to the action of the play; (2) minor characters, frequently, but by no means always, inorganic; and (3) important characters who are essential to the development of the drama. I shall follow this classification in my discussion of the unnamed characters (including those who are named in the scene-headings but not in the text).

I

Of the characters in the first group, Key says: "Incidental characters, who come in contact with the principal figures in the plot merely as instruments, are naturally unnamed in any form of drama. . . . Generally their part in the dialogue is brief and refers merely to their duties."¹¹ To this class belong the unnamed *lorarii* (*Merc.* 282; *Men.* 1015 f., *Mil. gl.* 1424; *Pseud.* 159),¹² the *servi* (*Aul.* 363 ff.; *Epid.* 400), the *ancilla* (*Poen.* 332),¹³ the *pueri* (*Capt.* 909 ff.; *Mil. gl.* 1378 ff.; *Most.* 885 ff.; *Poen.* 1141; *Pseud.* 767 ff.), and the *coqui* (*Cas.* 720; *Curec.* 251 ff.; *Pseud.* 798 ff.).¹⁴

Thus fifteen unnamed characters, about 36 per cent of the total number, are incidental characters who speak a few words, or, at most, a few lines. They are all servants of various kinds, *lorarii*, *pueri*, *coqui*, etc. Characters of this type are precisely the characters whom one should expect to be unnamed. But the practice of Plautus in regard to such characters varies. In many cases, similar incidental characters are named in the text. The *lorarii* in the *Captivi* are named

¹⁰ For a definition and discussion of inorganic roles see H. W. Prescott, "Inorganic Rôles in Roman Comedy," *Class. Phil.*, XV (1920), 245-81.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 81.

¹² References are to the text of the Teubner edition of G. Goetz and F. Schoell. Leo assigns *Pseud.* 159 to a *servus*.

¹³ Most editors agree in assigning *Poen.* 332 to the *ancilla*.

¹⁴ Key (*op. cit.*, p. 81) wrongly includes among the incidental characters the cook in *Merc.* 741 ff. (see below, p. 274). The *fudicina* (*Epid.* 496 ff.) and the *ancilla* (*Men.* 524 ff.), also listed by Key as incidental characters, I place among the minor inorganic characters.

Colaphus, Cordalio, and Corax (657), and we learn from *Rudens* 657, 798, and 807 that the *lorarii* in this play have the equally significant names of Turbalio and Sparax.¹⁵ The name of the *puer* in *Mostellaria* 419 has been plausibly emended as Sphaerio, and the cook in *Miles gloriosus* 1397 and 1427 is named Cario.¹⁶

In listing the incidental characters that are unnamed in the text, I have excluded all mute attendants, slaves, *lorarii*, etc., for these one should naturally expect to be unnamed.¹⁷ Many characters of this type, however, are named by Plautus. The names of the *tibicinae* in *Aulularia* II, 4 are given in 333 as Phrygia and Eleusium; a *lorarius* is named Artamo (*Bacch.* 799, 832); the *ancilla* in *Amphitruo* 770 is named Thessala.¹⁸

Of the fifteen unnamed characters listed above, three are of especial interest, for, although they are not named in the text, names are assigned to them in the scene-headings. These are the cook in *Casina* 720 ff., the *puer* in *Mostellaria* 885 ff., and the *servus* in *Aulularia* 363 ff.

¹⁵ Key (*op. cit.*, p. 81) incorrectly lists the *lorarii* of the *Captivi* and the *Rudens* among the characters who are unnamed.

¹⁶ The fact that unimportant characters like Cario and Sphaerio are named in the text but not in the scene-headings does not, as Prescott correctly shows ("Scene-Headings," *op. cit.*, pp. 105 f.), refute the theory that the names may have been lost from the scene-headings of an early archetype of the Palatine text and recovered from the text by a later copyist. To Prescott's list of names that are found in the text but not in the scene-headings should be added the names of the *lorarii* in the *Captivi* and the *Rudens*, the names of the *senex* and the *tonstrix* in the *Truculentus*, and, most important of all, the name of the soldier in the *Curculio*. The latter is present in four scenes (IV, 3, 4; V, 2, 3) and is essential to the recognition scene at the end of the play. The omission of his name from the scene-headings, although it is given as Therapontigonus four times in the text (408, 421, 430, 561), is a more serious obstacle to the theory of the later restoration of the scene-headings from the text. It is surprising that a scribe should have overlooked and failed to insert in the scene-headings the name of so important a character, especially since the headings in question give correctly the names of the other characters. The absence of the names of Callicles and Archilis from the heading to *Truc.* IV, 3 is less serious, as the other characters are likewise not named in this heading. It seems strange also that a scribe should have been misled by the *noster Geta* of *Truc.* 577 and should have written *GETA* in the heading to II, 7, overlooking the obviously correct name Cyamus in 583, 586, and 702. Cf. A. Krieger, *De Aululariae Plautinae exemplari Graeco* (Giessen, 1914), 35 f.

¹⁷ Mute roles are occasionally listed in the scene-headings, however. Cf. *TIBICINA* in the heading to *Stich.* V, 3; *LORARI*, *Most.* V, 1; *LORARIVS*, *Cure.* IV, 2. The presence of *PUER* in the heading to *Bacch.* IV, 1, therefore, does not necessarily imply that 581-83 should be assigned to the *puer*. All recent editors give these lines to the parasite and make the *puer* a silent figure.

¹⁸ Canthara (*Epid.* 567) and Decio (*Men.* 736) apparently remain off stage.

The cook in *Casina* III, 6 plays a very minor part in the scene, uttering only a few words. Although there seems no reason why he should be named, the heading to this scene in *A* gives CITRIO. Most editions give to the second *advorsitor* in the *Mostellaria* the name of Pinacium on the authority of *A* which reads *INA**U*.¹⁹ In each of these cases the restoration of the name from *A* is doubtful. Since characters of this type are frequently unnamed, and since, as I hope to show more clearly below, other names given by the headings of *A* are open to suspicion, it seems preferable to consider them as characters to whom Plautus assigned no names.

In *Aulularia* 363 ff. the *servus* who speaks eight lines presents a more difficult problem. The scene-headings in *BJ* give FITODICVS SERVVS and in *Z* the heading reads PYTHODICVS. Prescott considers²⁰ it quite possible that the name Pythodicus may have appeared in the text of some scene which is not now extant, especially since the end of the play has been lost. The scene in which Pythodicus appears, however, is merely an interlude between the departure of the cooks and the return of Euclio from the market, and Pythodicus closely resembles other incidental characters who appear once and only once. It is difficult, therefore, to see just how there would be an opportunity to mention his name at a later point in the play, but it is equally difficult to understand why, if the slave were originally unnamed, a scribe should have inserted into the scene-heading a name for so insignificant a character. It has also been suggested by Prescott that the slave in 363 ff. is the same Strobilus who is active in the preceding scenes and that FITODICVS arose from a corruption in the text of the play.²¹ Krieger believes that the FITODICVS SERVVS of the scene-

¹⁹ Although the roles of Phaniscus and Pinacium are essentially inorganic, "the author has done his best to attach them as closely as possible to the action" (Prescott, "Inorganic Rôles," *op. cit.*, p. 252).

²⁰ "Scene-headings," *op. cit.*, p. 103. Schmidt (*op. cit.*, p. 204) considers Philodicus more suitable for the name of the slave.

²¹ "The Name of the Slave in Plautus' *Aulularia*," *Proc. Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, XXXV (1904), xvii. The problem of the name Pythodicus, therefore, is linked with another problem, whether there is one or two slaves named Strobilus. Cf. Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (München, 1927), 59. Krieger (*op. cit.*, pp. 26 ff.) gives a summary of the various theories concerning Strobilus; he disapproves of the arbitrary change of the slave's name from Strobilus to Pythodicus in 264, 334, 351, and 354, as suggested by K. Dzitzko ("Zur *Aulularia* des Plautus," *Rhein. Mus.*, XXXVII [1882], 268), and adopted by Leo in his edition. Krieger says (p. 37) "Itaque

headings was originally nothing but **FIT ODIOSVS SERVVS**, abbreviated to **FITODIOS' SERVVS**.²² From this developed **FITODIOVS**, which in turn was easily changed to **FITODICVS**. Krieger also thinks that Strobilus remains on the stage in II, 7 and speaks 363 ff. before returning to the house of Megadorus, to which he has earlier sent Anthrax and his assistants (cf. 327 ff.).

The consensus of opinion appears to be that the slave in II, 4, 5, and 6 is identical with the slave in II, 7, and is either to be named Pythodicus, which necessitates the changing of the name of the slave from Strobilus to Pythodicus in the text four times, or he is to be named Strobilus and perhaps identified with the slave of Lyconides in IV.²³ In either case, the *servus* of II, 7 disappears as a separate individual, and the troublesome Pythodicus may, therefore, be removed from the list of unnamed characters.

Although this theory is attractive, it may be well to insert a brief *caveat* at this point. In a play as loosely constructed as the *Aulularia*, the entrances and exits are carelessly handled,²⁴ and it is certainly not impossible that 363–70 may have been spoken by a slave who enters immediately after the departure of the other characters, perhaps from Euclio's house, announces his intention of watching the cooks, and returns at once to the house. The entrance and exit of Anthrax in II, 9 are almost as poorly motivated. If the slave in II, 7 is viewed as a separate character and not considered identical with the Strobilus of the preceding scenes, it is very unlikely that his name ever appeared in the part of the play now lost. The **FITODICVS** of the scene-headings may well be the result of some corruption, although Krieger's explanation does not seem entirely satisfactory. Headings

in *Aulularia et Megadori et Lyconidis servo nomen 'Strobilus' esse oportet, sunt ergo una persona. Discrepantias inter utriusque communis servi partes, in quibus haeserunt viri docti, non tantas esse demonstrari potest, ut duas personas necesse sit putare.*" Cf. K. Kunst, *Studien zur griechischen-römischen Komödie* (Wien, 1919), 118 f. P. J. Enk ("De *Aulularia Plautina*," *Mnem.*, XLVII [1919], 89 f.) believes that Strobilus of Act II and Pythodicus are one and the same, but distinct from the Strobilus of Act IV, and so approves of the change of Strobilus to Pythodicus in 164, 334, 351, and 354. Moreover, Enk favors the name Philodicus, suggested by Schmidt.

²² *Op. cit.*, pp. 37 ff.

²³ Lindsay in his edition lists both Pythodicus and the *servus Lyconidis* as separate characters.

²⁴ Cf. Prescott, "Inorganic Rôles," *op. cit.*, pp. 252 f.

such as SERVVS EBRIVS (*Pseud.* V, 1) and CHLAMIDATVS (*Asin.* II, 4) are not good parallels for the ingenious conjecture of FIT ODIOSVS SERVVS.

II

We turn now to minor characters who are not named in the text. These are characters who play a more prominent part in the action than the incidental characters listed above. Some are inorganic, but others, although more temporary, are closely attached to the action.²⁵

The inorganic characters in this group consist of two *parasiti* (*Asin.* 749 ff., 854 ff.; *Bacch.* 573 ff.) who are intended primarily to add to the comic effect,²⁶ two *ancillae* (*Men.* 524 ff.; *Truc.* 789 ff.) who assist slightly in carrying forward the plot in their respective plays; the *choragus* (*Curc.* 462 ff.) whose function has been likened to that of the chorus in Greek drama;²⁷ the *piscatores* (*Rud.* 290 ff.), a *puer* (*Mil. gl.* 818 ff.), and a *servus* (*Truc.* 256 ff., 669 ff.), a total of eight characters. The last two characters, although unnamed in the text, have names assigned to them in the scene-headings.

In *Miles gloriosus* III, 2 appears the *puer ebrius* to whom the headings in *BD*²⁸ give the name LVCRI^O. Although the name does not occur in the text, the meaningless *votio* of 843 has been emended to Luerio (or Lurcio).²⁹ Lindsay originally suggested³⁰ that LVCRI^O came from the word LVRCHO which accompanied a picture of the tippling slave but later thought³¹ that PUER LVRCHO was a role title like SERVVS EBRIVS in the heading to *Pseudolus* V, 1. In either case, the *votio* of 843 may originally have been something quite different, and there is no very strong evidence that the *puer* was ever named; he appears only in this scene and, like many other similar characters, does not

²⁵ Cf. Prescott (*ibid.*, p. 246): "Inorganic rôles are likely to be temporary, but characters who appear temporarily are not necessarily inorganic."

²⁶ Cf. O. L. Wilner, "The Character Treatment of Inorganic Rôles in Roman Comedy," *Class. Phil.*, XXVI (1931), 272 f.; Prescott, "Inorganic Rôles," *op. cit.*, pp. 267 f.

²⁷ Prescott, "Inorganic Rôles," *op. cit.*, pp. 269 ff. The *choragus* is important economically. Prescott says: "He is clearly filling a gap which probably the dramatist could not easily cover by the use of organic rôles."

²⁸ The name is read Lurcio by many editors. Cf. A. Fleckeisen, "Zu Plautus Miles Gloriosus," *Jahr. für class. Phil.*, CI (1870), 846-48.

²⁹ *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.*, IX (1898), 109 n.

³⁰ *Ancient Editions*, p. 96 n.

advance the action. I have listed him here rather than among the incidental characters because his dialogue with Palaestrio provides considerable comic byplay and serves to fill in the absence of Periplectomenus from the stage.³¹

The problem of the slave in the *Truculentus* is similar. The headings to II, 2 give his name as TRVCVLENTVS (except F, which gives Stratilax), and the headings to III, 2 (D³F) give STRATILAX. Lindsay shows³² that Stratilax is a corruption of Strabax, the name of the adulescens rusticus who appears in III, 1 (the headings to which also read STRATILAX), and therefore thinks that Truculentus is the actual name. But SERVVS TRVCVLENTVS may well have been a role title such as SERVVS EBRIVS OR PUER LVRCHO, and, as such, would be accounted for by the remark of Astaphium in 265: *Nimis quidem hic truculentus.* Although the slave appears in only two scenes, his character is admirably portrayed and dominates the play, and it is very fitting that he gives to the play its title.³³

On the border line between inorganic and organic characters are the cook in the *Mercator* and the sister of Panegyris in the *Stichus*. Although most of the cooks in the plays of Plautus are not only inorganic but also incidental characters, the cook in *Mercator* IV, 4 plays a more prominent role, for he advances the action by betraying the secret of the *senex*.³⁴ The sister of Panegyris in the *Stichus* is the less prominent of the two sisters, although, owing to the peculiar structure of the play,³⁵ both sisters are present only in the opening scenes. The sister of Panegyris, although unnamed in the text, is named in the scene-headings of both A and P. The heading to I, 1 in A gives her

³¹ Cf. Prescott, "Inorganic Rôles," *op. cit.*, pp. 264 ff.

³² *Ancient Editions*, p. 103. Cf. E. W. Fay, "The Stratulax Scenes in Plautus' *Truculentus*," in *A Memorial Volume to Shakespeare and Harvey*, ed. A. C. Judson, J. T. Patterson, J. F. Royster (University of Texas Bulletin [Austin, Tex., 1917]), pp. 155-78. This article is likely to escape the notice of many classical scholars, as it is listed neither in the *Bibliotheca philologica classica*, Marouzeau's *Dix années de bibliographie classique*, nor Bursian's *Jahresbericht über Plautus 1912-1920* (192, 1922, 1 ff.). Fay disagrees with Lindsay and thinks Stratilax is the correct name; by a very ingenious but far-fetched conjecture he reads *Stratilax* in l. 264.

³³ Cf. the unnamed *sycophanta* in the *Trinummus* whose jest in 843 f. likewise gives to the play its name.

³⁴ Prescott, "Inorganic Rôles," *op. cit.*, p. 266.

³⁵ The structure of the *Stichus* has been the subject of much discussion. For bibliography see Schanz-Hosius, *op. cit.*, pp. 71 f.

name as PAMPHILA, while the same heading in the Palatine manuscripts gives the name as PINACIVM. Pinacium is clearly wrong, as it is the result of a misconception of 284, where the slave Pinacium is addressed.³⁶ The name Pamphila which occurs in A has been accepted by most editors as the name of the sister,³⁷ but it looks suspiciously like a development from Pamphilippus, the name of the husband. Moreover, A is here unreliable, as is shown by the fact that it gives to the other sister (in the heading to I, 1) the name PHILUMENA, although the correct name, appearing both in the text (247, 331) and in the Palatine scene-headings (I, 1; II, 2) is Panegyris.³⁸ There is no justification, therefore, for the name Pamphila, and the probability is that the character was never named by Plautus.³⁹

In the group of minor characters who are not named in the text of the plays, the following are organic: the *mercator* (*Asin.* 381 ff.), *virgo* (*Aul.* 682 ff.), *lena* (*Cist.* 14 ff.), *senex* (*Cist.* 305 ff.), *matrona* (*Cist.* 543 ff.), *fidicina* (*Epid.* 496 ff.), *miles* (*Epid.* 437 ff.), *danista* (*Epid.* 629 ff.), *medicus* (*Men.* 889 ff.), *advocati* (*Poen.* 515 ff.), and *sycophanta* (*Trin.* 843 ff.). The characters in this group are essential to the action and are chiefly domestic or professional roles. Professional characters such as the *mercator*, the *danista*, and the *medicus* are organic, even though the part they play may at times be brief.⁴⁰

Three of the characters listed above are found in the *Cistellaria*, the text of which is in a very corrupt state. It is possible that these

³⁶ Prescott, "Scene-Headings," *op. cit.*, pp. 107 f.; Lindsay, *Ancient Editions*, pp. 102 f.

³⁷ Leo, however, does not accept it. He gives in his index: "Pamphila . . . nomen non a Plauto inditum." Cf. also G. Goetz, *Stichus* (Leipzig, 1883), Praef., xvi.

³⁸ A gives the name correctly in the heading to II, 2.

³⁹ A. Spengel (*Scenentitel und Scenenabtheilung in der lateinischen Komödie* [Sitzungsber. bayer. Akad.] (1883)], pp. 257 ff.) argues from this and other instances that the names in the headings of A were often arbitrarily assigned to the characters and so are less reliable than those of the Palatine recension which were restored, sometimes incorrectly, from the text. He says (p. 264): "Der Schreiber des Ambr. oder seines Archetypus erfand als zweiten Namen willkürlich Pamphila, wohl in Erinnerung an den Gebrauch dieses Namens bei Terentius, als ersten setzte er Philumena entweder gleichfalls aus Terentius oder infolge blosser Verschreibung für Panegyris."

⁴⁰ Prescott, "Inorganic Rôles," *op. cit.*, pp. 166 f. I have not included among the unnamed characters the *danista* of the *Mostellaria*, although E. A. Sonnenschein (p. 61 of his edition) suggests that Misargyrides in 568 may be a nickname invented for the occasion by Tranio. Cf. Schoell's edition, Praef., xxxviii. Misargyrides has been accepted as the correct emendation of the *mi sarcirites*, given by B (*mis artirites*, CD).

three characters, *lena*, *senex*, and *matrona*, may have been named in the lost portions of the text.⁴¹ The likelihood is greatest in the case of the *matrona*, for the Palatine headings (to II, 3; IV, 1, 2) give the name PHANOSTRATA, and, as far as we can judge, she plays a more important part in the action than either of the other unnamed characters. However, as Key points out,⁴² her very first utterance shows that she is the mistress of Lampadio and so wife of Demipho. Her identity is thus clearly established without need of a name. The name Syra, which is sometimes assigned to the *lena* in *Cistellaria I*, 1 and 2, rests on a conjecture of Studemund,⁴³ which in turn is based on two citations of Festus. Festus quotes line 408 of the *Cistellaria* as "in Syr."⁴⁴ and Studemund thinks that the name of the *lena* may have been Syra. An examination of the references in Festus to the plays of Plautus reveals that, whenever Festus gives more than Plautus' name, he cites always by the name of the play and never by the name of the character. Studemund's theory, therefore, would make it necessary for us to accept *Syra* as an alternate title for the play.⁴⁵ How unsound this is has recently been shown by the publication of a medieval letter in which occurs a reference to *Cist.* 408 in the following form: "Habitet Plautus in Sinaristosis sine extortis talis."⁴⁶ The references of Festus are thus to the abbreviated form of the Greek title of the *Cistellaria*, the Συναριστώσαι, and all likelihood that the *lena* was named

⁴¹ The fact that there are three unnamed characters in this play proves nothing, for the *Epidicus*, a shorter play, has four characters without names, three of them organic; the *Menaechmi* has five unnamed characters, of which three are likewise organic. Every play except the *Amphitruo* contains at least one unnamed character. The isolated position of the *Amphitruo* in this respect is interesting in view of the fact that it is the only play of its type extant in Roman comedy.

⁴² *Op. cit.*, p. 82. Key lists the *matrona* among the most important unnamed characters.

⁴³ W. Studemund, "Herstellungsversuch der plautinischen *Cistellaria*," *Studien*, II (Berlin, 1891), 419 n.

⁴⁴ Lindsay in his edition of Festus (Leipzig, 1913) reads "in Sym." (p. 390) and "in Sy." (p. 480).

⁴⁵ *Syrus* has also been suggested as the title of the play. Cf. Schanz-Hosius, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁴⁶ B. Bischoff, "Zu Plautus und Festus," *Philol.*, LXXXVII (1932), 115. E. Fraenkel ("Das Original der *Cistellaria* des Plautus," *Philol.*, LXXXVII [1932], 118) says: "Jetzt macht das neue Zeugnis mit einem Schlage der Unsicherheit ein Ende und wir sehen dass . . . die Reste der Lemmata zu *Cist.* 408 in *Syn.* . und in *Sy.* . nichts anderes sind als eben die Anfangsbuchstaben von *in Sinaristosis*." This had already been conjectured by B. Prehn, *Quaestiones Plautinae* (Breslau, 1916), 10 n.

Syra vanishes. Since the Palatine scene-headings to I, 1 do not give the name of the *lena*, although they give the name of the *meretrices*, it is extremely improbable that the *lena* ever had a name.

Two other characters in this group, besides the *matrona* in the *Cistellaria*, are named in the scene-headings. The Palatine headings to *Asinaria* II, 3 give merely *MERCATOR*, but to II, 4 they give for the same character *CHIAMIDATVS* (*CHLAMIDATVS*, *B*). As in the case of Lucrio in the *Miles gloriosus*, Lindsay first suggested that "chlamydatus," "the man in the travelling-cloak," was the kind of designation that might have been scribbled below a picture of the *mercator*, but later he considered it merely as a role title.⁴⁷ Editors agree in rejecting Chlamydatus as a proper name assigned by Plautus to the *mercator*.

The name of Euclio's daughter in the *Aulularia* is given in the Palatine headings to IV, 7 as *PHEDRIA* (*FEDRIA*, *B*). Although she speaks only a few words and does not appear on the stage, she is an important element in the plot of the play, and it is possible that she may have been mentioned by name in the conclusion of the play which is not extant.⁴⁸

There are thus twenty-one minor characters that are unnamed in the text of the play. Of these, at least eleven, and probably thirteen (if we include the cook in the *Mercator* and the sister of Panegyris in the *Stichus*), should be considered as organic characters. The names Phaedria and Phanostrata may have occurred in the text, but there is no evidence for assuming that the others were ever so named. In the case of the *mercator* (*Asinaria*), the *puer* (*Miles gloriosus*), and the slave (*Truculentus*), the role titles were probably mistaken as names, while the name Pamphila (*Stichus*) seems an arbitrary insertion into the scene-heading of *A*.

III

There remain four characters, unnamed in the text, who have organic roles of much greater importance.

The *matrona* in the *Menaechmi* is present in four scenes (IV, 1, 2;

⁴⁷ *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.*, IX (1898), 109 n.; *Ancient Editions*, p. 96 n.

⁴⁸ Lindsay assumes (*Ancient Editions*, p. 101 n.) that both *PHEDRIA* and *FITODICVS* were taken from the text at the end of the play. This is extremely unlikely in the case of the name *FITODICVS* (see above, pp. 271 ff.). Schmidt (*op. cit.*, p. 199) says of Phaedria: "Die Ueberlieferung kann nicht richtig sein," and favors Phaedrium, suggested by Leo.

V, 1, 2), and her father, the *senex*, is present in five (V, 2-5, 7). Both characters play a very important part in the confusion caused by the arrival of the twin brother. The *matrona* in an amusing scene (IV, 2) accuses her husband of the theft of the *palla*, which he attempts to deny but finally admits, saying: *non condonauit, sed sic utendam dedi* (657). She declares that he cannot return home unless he brings the *palla* with him. In the next act she meets the twin brother of her husband, and his remarks seem so strange that she sends for her father. The *senex* arrives and in one of the most delightful scenes of the play both *senex* and *matrona* become more and more bewildered by the strange manner of the person whom they believe to be Menaechmus. The latter decides to profit by their confusion and pretends to be insane. His acting drives the *matrona* indoors, while the *senex* goes for the doctor. When he returns, followed almost immediately by the doctor, it is actually his son-in-law that the *senex* meets. Menaechmus' ignorance of what has gone before and his annoyance at their comments serve merely to convince them of his insanity, and he would have been carried off to the doctor's home, had it not been for the timely intervention of Messenio, who thought he was aiding his master.

The *Menaechmi* has five unnamed characters, a larger number than any other Plautine play, and three of the unnamed characters, *matrona*, *senex*, and *medicus*, are organic.⁴⁹ It is surprising that characters as important as the *matrona* and the *senex* are nowhere named in the text of the play. To Menaechmus Sosicles they are strangers, and naturally he cannot call them by name. But if Plautus had assigned a name to the *matrona*, we should expect her to be so addressed by her husband or her father, or perhaps even by Peniculus. The *senex* is consistently called *pater* by his daughter (cf. 734, 736, 775, 780, 782, 798, 806, 834, 843, 851), and the doctor, who might be expected to address him by name, calls him merely *senex* (889). There is no indication, therefore, that Plautus ever assigned a name to either the *matrona* or the *senex*, in spite of the fact that they are two of the most prominent characters in the play.

In the *Persa*, Saturio's daughter plays the part of a Persian captive

⁴⁹ The *ancilla* and the *lorarii* in the *Menaechmi* are also unnamed. It is interesting to note that the cook in the same play, a character of minor importance, is named in the text three times (218, 294, 295). The justification for his name occurs in the joke in 295.

and is sold to Dordalus; it is by this trick that the discomfiture of the *leno* is brought about. The maiden appears in eight scenes (III, 1; IV, 2, 4-9), and takes a prominent part in the action of the drama. The wit and cleverness which she displays add much to the comedy. Her acting well deserves the comment of Toxilus: *Ah, di istam perdant: ita catast et callida. Vt sapiens habet cor: quam dicit quod opus* (622 f.). There is, of course, no opportunity for the mention of her real name in the scenes in which she acts the part of the Persian girl (IV, 4-7). The name Lucris which appears in 624 is, as the context shows, a fictitious name and is given to make possible the pun in the lines which follow; Dordalus says: *Si te emam, mihi quoque Lucridem confido fore te* (626 f.; cf. also 515 f., 689, 712 f.). In the scenes in which the maiden appears in her true form (III, 1; IV, 2, 8-9), she is everywhere referred to as *filia*, *gnata*, and *virgo*, even by her father (cf. *gnata*, 332, 740, 752; *virgo*, 336). The scene-headings list her merely as **VIRGO** with the exception of the heading of *D* to IV, 5 which gives **PERSA VIRGO**, perhaps the result of a misconception of 676 where Sagaristio is addressed as Persa. The real name of Saturio's daughter, therefore, remains unknown, and we have one more illustration of Plautus' tendency to leave some of his important characters unnamed.

The *senex* in the *Casina* is by far the most important of all the unnamed characters in the plays of Plautus. The play deals with the attempt of the *senex* to win for himself the girl whom his son loves by marrying her to his servant Olympio, and with the farcical outcome of the wedding when a slave is substituted for the bride. Some idea of the importance of the *senex* may be gathered from the following facts: he is present in fifteen of the twenty-three scenes of the play, he speaks two hundred and forty times, and his speeches total approximately three hundred and forty lines, or more than one-third of the entire play. Lindsay says:

Some scholars suppose that Plautus did not assign a name to some of his characters. . . . This seems to me extremely unlikely in the case of the leading characters of a play, like Lysidamus in the *Casina* and Menaechmus' wife in the *Menaechmi*, although it is conceivable for minor personages.⁵⁰

But the wife of Menaechmus is, as we have seen, scarcely more important than several other characters who have no names. Of the

⁵⁰ *Ancient Editions*, p. 93.

thirty-nine or forty unnamed characters, there are fifteen or more that are organic. In other words, about 38 per cent of the unnamed characters are essential to the action.⁵¹ This is too large a proportion to explain away as Lindsay seeks to do.

The problem of the *senex* in the *Casina* is of particular interest; although he is not named in the text, his name appears in the scene-headings of *A* as LYSIDAMUS (III, 4, 5; cf. III, 3, 6; IV, 3), while the heading of *B* to II, 3 gives STALITIO and that of *B*² to III, 3 gives STALICIO.⁵² The name Stalicio, as has been pointed out,⁵³ arises from a corruption and misconception of 960, where the *senex* is addressed with the words: *Heus, sta ilico, amator.*⁵⁴

The presence of the name Lysidamus in the headings of *A* and the fact that the *senex* is such an important character have led editors to accept this name. The very importance of his role, however, seems a strong argument against his ever having had a name. It seems inconceivable that Plautus should have assigned a name to such a prominent character and yet never mentioned the name in the text. Lindsay himself admits⁵⁵ that there is absolutely no indication that the name Lysidamus ever occurred in a part of the text that is now lost. Yet there are numerous opportunities for the name of the *senex* to be mentioned in the play as it now stands. Everywhere he is called *vir*, *senex*, *eris*, *amator*, not to mention more expressive terms such as *flagitium hominis* and *cana culex*. The role seems to be the important thing, and the old man becomes a typical *senex* of comedy.

When we examine Plautus' procedure in other plays, we find that the names of similarly prominent *senes* are given in the text with great frequency. For example, the name Hegio is mentioned in the text of the *Captivi* twenty-four times, Euclio in the *Aulularia* is named

⁵¹ This total does not include Phanostrata (*Cist.*) and Phaedria (*Aul.*) for they may have been named in the text. If they are included, the proportion of organic characters is more than 42 per cent of the total number of unnamed characters.

⁵² Most Palatine headings, however, give merely SENEX. Stalino, a corrupt form of Stalicio, is given in the heading to II, 3 by VEJFZ and frequently thereafter by F and Z.

⁵³ Cf. W. Studemund, *Emendationes Plautinæ* (Greifswald, 1871), 1-7; Ritschl, *op. cit.*, pp. 321 f.; Lindsay, *Ancient Editions*, p. 94.

⁵⁴ Cf. also 347, where *titibilicio* was read *tit tibi stalitio*.

⁵⁵ *Ancient Editions*, p. 94 n. There seems no basis for Studemund's assertion (*op. cit.*, p. 7): "[Nomen senis] Videtur igitur pronuntiatum fuisse in eorum versuum aliquo, qui nunc aut omnino interciderunt aut ex parte mutili servati sunt."

eighteen times, Charmides in the *Trinummus* twenty-one times, etc. Callipho, an unimportant *senex* in the *Pseudolus*, who is present in only one scene, is mentioned by name six times; Megadorus, a minor *senex* in the *Aulularia*, is named no less than eleven times. If, as Lindsay assumes, Lysidamus is the name assigned by Plautus to the *senex* of the *Casina*, how does it happen that in this instance Plautus made such a radical departure from his normal procedure and nowhere in the text had occasion to mention Lysidamus by name?

Since the *senex* is an excellent example of the lecherous old reprobate who is outwitted by the wily slave, it seems possible that in this case the role was clearly defined and sufficiently emphasized so that Plautus felt that no name was needed for the character. The ancient editors of *A*, feeling the need of a name for such an important character, may have arbitrarily supplied the name in the scene-headings.⁶⁶ It is much more likely that a name would have been supplied for an unnamed character of such prominence than to unimportant characters who happened to be unnamed.

The *Casina*, therefore, offers us a unique example of a play in which the most important character is nowhere mentioned by name in the text. If, as I have suggested, Plautus felt in this instance that the role was all-important, the reason may be that in this play the influence of the Italian farces, such as the *Atellanae* with their fixed roles, is predominant. Leo believed that the *Casina*, in structure, content, and meter, shows strongly the influence of the farces of southern Italy, particularly of the Greek φλύακες,⁶⁷ and it is not unlikely that the

⁶⁶ I have already mentioned the possibility that the name of Panegyris' sister in the *Stichus*, given in *A* as Pamphila, may be the invention of some later editor. This is perhaps true also of Citro (Cas.) and Pinacium (Most.). Lysidamus may have been the name of the *senex* in the Greek original of the *Casina*, and an editor may have inserted it in the scene-headings of *A* from that source. Schmidt (*op. cit.*, p. 195) considers Lysidamus a good Attic name, and adds, "Jedenfalls sind wir nicht berechtigt, in dieser Namensform suditalischen Einfluss anzunehmen."

⁶⁷ F. Leo, *Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik* (Berlin, 1897), 104 ff.; *Plautinische Forschungen*, p. 208. Th. Ladewig ("Einleitungen und Anmerkungen zu plautinischen Lustspielen," *Rh. Mus.*, III [1845], 192) had earlier expressed the view that the second part of the *Casina* was modeled upon an Atellan farce (cf. W. S. Teuffel, *Studien und Charakteristiken* [2d ed.; Leipzig, 1889], p. 320). Leo's view was strongly combated by P. Legrand ("Conjectures sur la composition des Κληρούετοι de Diphile," *Rev. d. ét. grec.*, XV [1902], 370 ff.), A. Schmitt (*De Pseudoloi Plautinæ exemplo Attico* [Strassburg, 1909], pp. 60 ff.), and W. Süss ("Zwei Bemerkungen zur Technik der Komödie," *Rh. Mus.*, LXV [1910], 457 ff.). E. Fraenkel (*Plautini-*

curious feature of the unnamed *senex* is linked with this problem. If the farcical elements in the latter part of the *Casina* reflect Italian farce rather than Greek comedy, it is not so surprising that Plautus should have chosen to give no name to the leading character of the play. Certainly, the very importance of his role makes it difficult to understand why, if he were named by Plautus, the name nowhere appears in the text of the play. The names Phanostrata and Phaedria, which appear in the Palatine scene-headings, may be survivals of original Plautine names, but I see no reason for assuming that Plautus ever gave the name Lysidamus to the *senex* in the *Casina*.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

sches im Plautus [Berlin, 1922], pp. 312 f.) says: "Mit der Möglichkeit einer solchen Entlehnung muss man durchaus rechnen; die Sphäre jener derben Spiele ist dem Plautus sicherlich vertraut gewesen," but thinks that the obscenity of the conclusion of the play is no argument against Attic origin. G. Jachmann (*Plautinisches und Attisches* [Berlin, 1931], pp. 116, 122 ff.) asserts that not only the first part of the *Casina* but the conclusion as well comes from the Κληρούμενοι of Diphilus. For a brief defense of Leo's view see O. Immisch, *Zur Frage der plautinischen Cantica* ("Sitzungsber. Heidelb. Akad.", Vol. XIV [1923]), Part VII, 40 f. The influence of the *Atellanae* upon the comedies of Plautus has recently been maintained by W. Beare ("Plautus and the *Fabula Atellana*," *Class. Rev.*, XLIV [1930], 165-68). Beare does not, however, discuss the *Casina* in this connection.

EQUITES AND CELERES

H. HILL

PRACTICALLY all histories of Rome and reference books of every kind¹ assume that Celeres was merely an old name for the equites, and scholars seem to have no qualms about using evidence which concerns the Celeres in their accounts of the early equites. Yet this identification is, to say the least, far from certain; and I hope to show in this article that there are strong reasons for believing it to be incorrect.

We must first examine the ancient evidence. Among ancient writers, as is generally admitted, we find traces of two distinct views as to who the Celeres were. One is that adopted by modern scholars, i.e., that they were the early equites; the other, that they were a body-guard for the kings. Those favoring the former view are Festus,² Pliny the Elder,³ Servius,⁴ Lydus,⁵ and Pomponius.⁶ The latter version has the support of Livy,⁷ Dionysius of Halicarnassus,⁸ Plutarch,⁹ and Zonaras.¹⁰ There is one point about this division of the authorities which must be made clear. It has been said¹¹ that Dionysius identifies Celeres with equites, but this is incorrect. In ii. 2 he describes Romulus as having, at the foundation of Rome, a force of three thousand infantry and three hundred cavalry, and in ii. 16 he says that this force had increased, by the end of Romulus' reign, to forty-six thousand infantry and nearly one thousand cavalry. The numbers are, of course, absurd; but it is important that Dionysius conceived of an increase in the number of cavalry. He speaks also of *ἱππέων ἡγεμόνες*, parallel with infantry commanders, including among them Tar-

¹ The only exception, so far as I know, is Daremberg et Saglio, *s.v.*

² Paul. *ex Fest.*, *s.v.* "Celeres," p. 48 (Lindsay).

³ *Nat. hist.* xxxiii. 35.

⁴ *Ad Aen.* ix. 368; xi. 603.

⁵ ii. 13, 29, 64; iv. 71, 75.

⁶ *De mag.* i. 9.

⁷ *Romulus* 26; *Numa* 7.

⁸ *Dig.* i. 2. 2. 15; ii. 15. 9.

⁹ vii. 4, 5, 10; cf. Dio Cass. *Frag.* 10. 5.

¹⁰ i. 15 (cf. *ibid.* 13).

¹¹ E.g., by Belot, *Hist. des chev. rom.*, I, 136 f.

quin¹² and Servius Tullius.¹³ Such is his account of the equites. Of the Celeres (*κελέριοι*) he gives a quite distinct account, describing how Romulus, after having chosen his senate (and therefore some time after the founding of Rome and the establishment of the corps of three hundred equites), selected three hundred of the noblest and strongest youths to act as his bodyguard, under the title of *κελέριοι*. They fought as cavalry or infantry at need and had their own commander (*ἡγεμόνων*), with three junior officers (*έκατοντάρχαι*). Dionysius compares them with the bodyguard of the kings of Sparta.¹⁴ Numa, he says, gave priesthoods to the *ἡγεμόνες τῶν κελερίων*,¹⁵ and Brutus held this office when he summoned the assembly after the expulsion of Tarquin.¹⁶ Their numbers, unlike those of the cavalry, remained the same.¹⁷ There could be no clearer case of separation, and Dionysius must be reckoned with Livy, Plutarch, and Zonaras.

The grouping of the authorities is striking. They may be said to represent two different types of tradition, the antiquarian and the historical. Now Livy and Dionysius are our two chief authorities for the early history of the equites, as they are for all the early history of Rome; and when some minor authority contradicts their evidence, they are usually followed.¹⁸ Yet, on this point their evidence, supported by that of Plutarch and Zonaras, is rejected in favor of that of far less reliable authors. Festus cannot stand against Livy and Dionysius; Pliny's account of the equites is admittedly incorrect,¹⁹ and Pomponius, Servius, and Lydus are surely not to be preferred to Plutarch and Zonaras.

So much, then, for the ancient evidence. It is clear that these two different views of the Celeres were current in antiquity, and it was inevitable that they should be mixed to some extent. Hence we must not give much weight to accidental similarities between equites and Celeres. Both are, for instance, said to have been three hundred in number and chosen from the richest and noblest families. This may

¹² iii. 41, 53, 64–65; iv. 6.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 64.

¹³ iv. 3.

¹⁶ iv. 71, 75.

¹⁴ ii. 13.

¹⁷ ii. 29.

¹⁸ E.g., Festus' account of the *Sex suffragia* (p. 452 [Lindsay]) is usually rejected in favor of that of Livy and others.

¹⁹ See, e.g., Madvig, *Verfass. und Verwalt.*, p. 156 n.; yet Madvig accepts Pliny's version of the Celeres.

be correct, but it is more probably the result of "contamination" of the two versions.²⁰ We are bound, therefore, to follow the better authorities, unless we can produce other evidence or convincing arguments for the other version. The numerous modern writers who have dealt with the subject have produced several arguments and one piece of evidence to justify their acceptance of the less well-supported version. I propose to deal first with the arguments. For the sake of brevity, I tabulate them below, and deal with them in turn.

1. That it is unlikely that the early kings, especially the pacific Romulus, would have a bodyguard of this kind, particularly as the lictors represent a kind of bodyguard.²¹

If they had no bodyguard, they differed from all ancient monarchs—and from modern monarchs, too, for that matter. The comparison with Sparta which Dionysius makes is a sufficient reply to this argument. The lictors were a totally inadequate protection, especially in battle.

2. That such a bodyguard, if it existed, would have been chosen, not from young nobles, but from among the clients of the king, since the nobility seems to have been hostile to the monarchy.²²

Again the Spartan analogy is to the point. But we must notice, further, that we need not assume that the Celeres were nobles. This detail may be the result of the "contamination" mentioned above.

3. That three hundred was, in any case, too large a number for a bodyguard.

This too, as has been said, may be the result of "contamination." But even if the number is accepted, we cannot say that it is excessive when we compare, for instance, the Praetorian Guard or Alexander's Sacred Band.

4. That Cicero, in the *De republica*, makes no mention of a royal bodyguard, and, in fact, denies that one existed in *Phil.* v. 6.²³

Cicero does not mention the Celeres at all in his account of the early

²⁰ Plutarch has been accused of inventing the story (in *Numa* 7) that Numa disbanded the Celeres, to support his version of them. The same accusation might be made against those supporters of the opposite version who make the total of both Celeres and equites three hundred.

²¹ Madvig, *op. cit.*, I, 156–58.

²² Niebuhr, *Hist.*, I, 331; F. Muhlert, *De equ. Rom.* (Hildesiae, 1830), p. 3.

²³ Muhlert, *loc. cit.*

constitution, nor is that account such as to make it necessary for him to mention the royal bodyguard. *Phil.* v. 6 is, as Muhlert himself admits, a highly rhetorical passage, where it was convenient for Cicero to forget about any tradition of a bodyguard for the early kings. He also ignores a far more obvious case of a bodyguard, that of Sulla.

5. That Celer, traditionally the first commander of the Celeres, is described by Servius (*Ad Aen.* xi. 603) as *tribunus equitum*.²⁴

This proves nothing except that Servius identified Celeres with equites.²⁵ Celer himself, of course, is an etiological myth. Whatever be the true etymology of the word "Celeres," it does not affect the point at issue, because all the suggested explanations of the title would apply just as well to a bodyguard as to a cavalry force.

6. An ingenious theory propounded by Belot,²⁶ and based on Dionysius ii. 13, δὸνομα δὲ κοινὸν ἄπαντες, δὲ καὶ οἱ νῦν κατέστησαν, ἔσχον κελερίοι. Belot takes the words δὲ καὶ οἱ νῦν κατέστησαν to mean that Augustus revived the old title Celeres and applied it to the equites of his own day.

A very far-fetched suggestion. The meaning cannot be got out of the Greek; and, in fact, some editors (e.g., Kiessling and Prou) bracket the words δὲ . . . κατέστησαν. Moreover, we have absolutely no evidence of the use of the title under Augustus. Further, as has been shown above, Dionysius distinguishes Celeres from equites; and finally, even if the theory were correct, it would only prove that Augustus officially accepted one of the two current versions of the Celeres, not that that version was the true one, as Belot himself admits.

7. Last, and most important, are the arguments based on the mysterious office of *tribunus celerum* (δὸν γεμών τῶν κελερίων). Of him Mommsen says "sicher ist nur die Benennung und die Mehrzahl, wahrscheinlich die Identification derselben mit den von Antias (ap. Dion. Hal.) erwähnten drei Centurionen der Ritter."²⁷ This is an excellent example of the kind of statement made about the Celeres. Only the first five words of it are justified by the evidence. The statement about their "Mehrzahl" is an assumption made, as we shall see

²⁴ Mommsen, *Staatsr.*, II, 169.

²⁵ The author of the *De viris illust.* 1. calls Celer *centurio*.

²⁶ *Loc. cit.*

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, III, 108, n. 1.

later, on quite inadequate evidence; and the rest is a *petitio principii*. Actually Mommsen's "Centurionen der Ritter" are the ἑκατοντάρχαι τῶν κελερίων of Dionysius,²⁸ and he is thus assuming the identity he is trying to prove.

Pomponius and Lydus, followed by many modern scholars,²⁹ see in the *tribunus celerum* the prototype of the *magister equitum* of the Republic. I cannot here enter into a discussion of the two prevailing theories about the *magister equitum* and his origin; and there is no need to, because, though his identification with the *tribunus celerum* is far from certain, it would not, even if it were certain, affect the point at issue. If the dictatorship was a reversion to the old kingship, then it is possible that the *magister equitum* reproduced the king's second-in-command, the *tribunus celerum*. But this does not prove that the *tribunus celerum* was a *magister equitum*. The king's second-in-command may just as well have been the commander of his bodyguard; and the *magister equitum* was, in fact, not so much a commander of cavalry as a second-in-command to the dictator. There is nothing surprising, for instance, in the story that Brutus, as *tribunus celerum*, summoned the assembly, though we may doubt the truth of the story itself.³⁰ Similar powers were given to the commander of the imperial bodyguard, the *praefectus praetorio*.

We have now dealt with the various arguments brought forward in support of the identification of Celeres with equites. Not one of them can be said to be convincing; and, in fact, they give us no help in making an unbiased decision between the two versions. Let us turn, therefore, to the new evidence mentioned above. This consists of a fragment of the *fasti Praenestini* relating to the festival of the Quinquatrus celebrated on March 19. When amplified by conjecture, it reads: "⟨Salii⟩ faciunt in comitio saltu[s adstantibus po]ntificibus et tri⟨bunis⟩ celer⟨um⟩."³¹ The only doubtful point in the restoration is whether we should read *tri⟨buno⟩ celer⟨um⟩* instead of *tri⟨bunis⟩ celer⟨um⟩*. I believe we should, for reasons which will appear.

²⁸ Dion. Hal. ii. 13.

²⁹ See, e.g., Mommsen, *op. cit.*, II, 169. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. "Magister Equitum, etc."

³⁰ Dion. Hal. iv. 71, 75; Livy i. 59; Servius *Ad Aen.* viii. 646.

³¹ CIL, I², 234.

In the first place, the fragment confirms the statement of Dionysius³² that the *tribunus (tribuni) celerum* held a priesthood. That is all we can say with certainty. The rest is conjecture. In his discussion of the Quinquatrus, Warde Fowler³³ plausibly argues that it was a festival for the purification of arms. But, because he assumes that the *tribunus celerum* was a commander of cavalry, he has to make the quite unfounded assumption that the infantry were represented at the festival by the *tribuni militum*. Helbig,³⁴ with more justification, suggests that the Salii represent the infantry. Both these scholars ignore the fact that, if any parallel can be made, it must be between the *tribunus celerum* and the Pontifices, since the Salii are performing the ceremony, and the other two are onlookers. Now the chief pontiff was the heir to the religious duties of the king; and the *rex sacrorum*, another relic of the kingship, was a member of the pontifical college. The natural explanation of the ceremony, therefore, is that it derives from the period of the kings and that the pontiffs represent the king. The *tribunus celerum*, therefore, represents some person or body of persons either closely connected with or parallel to the king. This leaves our problem still unsolved, though it is slightly in favor of the view that the *tribunus celerum* was the commander of the bodyguard and not of the cavalry. It clearly makes him the second-in-command. The military element in the festival is represented by the Salii, who were of definitely military origin.³⁵

Whether there was a single *tribunus celerum* or several is not known. Since the *fasti Praenestini* have only *trib. celer.*, which may be either singular or plural, the only definite evidence we have is that of Dionysius, who speaks of a single ἡγεμόν. ³⁶

There is one further point which seems to me to break down the generally accepted view of the Celeres. The titles Celeres and *tribunus celerum* disappeared when the kingship came to an end, except

³² ii. 64.

³³ *Roman Festivals*, pp. 57 f.

³⁴ "Die Equites als beritt. Hoplit.," *Abh. d. I. Kl. d. K. Ak. d. Wiss., zu München* XXIII, Abt. II (1905), pp. 299 f., 310.

³⁵ See, e.g., W. Helbig, "Sur les attributs des Saliens," *C. R. Acad. Insc.* 1904, pp. 202, 206.

³⁶ ii. 13; iv. 71, 75. Where, as in his reference to their priesthoods (ii. 64), he uses the plural, it is merely the plural of general statement.

that the latter survived in an obscure priesthood. If the Celeres were merely equites, why should their title be changed?³⁷ And if the *tribunus celerum* was merely a commander of cavalry, why should the office suffer the same fate as that of the king? Lange's suggestion (the only attempt to explain this, so far as I know) is that both titles were dropped at the Servian Reform because their religious connections forbade their being applied to the new cavalry units containing plebeians.³⁸ But the same argument would apply equally to the old names Rhamnes, Tities, and Luceres, which were retained for the patrician cavalry detachments after the Servian Reform. Why do we not find the title Celeres applied also to those patrician detachments? If, however, the Celeres were the king's bodyguard and the *tribunus celerum* was their commander, it is easy to see why those titles shared the same fate as that of *rex*.

To sum up: the best ancient authorities make a clear distinction between equites and Celeres, and describe the latter as the royal bodyguard. Not a single argument produced by modern scholars in support of the alternative view that the Celeres were the early equites can stand criticism. The position of the *tribunus celerum* as a priest in the republican period is consistent with his having been second only to the king, and the disappearance of the Celeres and of their commander, except as a priestly relic, points again to some close connection with the king.

I therefore conclude that Livy, Dionysius, Plutarch, and Zonaras were nearer to the truth than the other ancient writers. There is, however, a possibility that the real truth lies somewhere between the two versions. The researches of Helbig³⁹ have made it probable that the early equites were not true cavalry at all, but what Helbig calls "mounted hoplites," using horses as a means of transport but actually fighting mainly on foot. Now, ancient accounts of the equites leave only the very faintest traces of this; but when Dionysius describes the Celeres, he says they were *ἰππεῖς μὲν ἔνθα ἐπιτήδειον εἴη πεδίον*

³⁷ The other old titles for the equites (*flexumines* and *trossuli*) probably represent an earlier type of equipment or tactics, and so are not parallel to Celeres.

³⁸ *Röm. Alt.*, I, 535. Lange is, of course, assuming that the Servian Reform belongs to the regal period—by no means a safe assumption.

³⁹ "Die Equites als beritt. Hoplit."

*ένιππομαχῆσαι, πεζοὶ δὲ ὅπου τραχὺς εἶη καὶ ἀνιππός τόπος.*⁴⁰ This argues some connection between Celeres and equites, and it is possible that the Celeres were actually a section of the equites. Further support for this suggestion comes from a passage where Dionysius speaks of King Tullus as *ἐν τοῖς ἐπιλέκτοις τῶν ιππέων μαχόμενος*.⁴¹ Such a solution of the difficulty would explain how the two versions of the Celeres arose, and make the analogy with the "Companions" of Philip and Alexander still closer.

Apparently, after the expulsion of the kings it remained the practice to use a section of the equites as a bodyguard for the consul or dictator in battle.⁴² This was the *cohors praetoria*, to which infantry were later admitted, and from which developed the Praetorian Guard of the emperors. There was thus an unbroken line of connection between the bodyguard of the early kings and that of the emperors.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, SWANSEA

⁴⁰ ii. 13.

⁴¹ iii. 24.

⁴² See, e.g., Livy ii. 20. 4-5; Dion. Hal. vi. 11, 12; ix. 57, 65; Livy xxii. 49, etc.; Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, 389.

WAS DEMOSTHENES A PANHELLENIST?

H. B. DUNKEL

WHETHER or not the political viewpoint of Demosthenes was Panhellenic is not a new question. Because the decision made on this point greatly influences one's final judgment of Demosthenes' purpose as a statesman and his sincerity as an orator, nearly every attempt to treat the history of Greece during the fourth century B.C. has considered, at least in passing, that orator's attitude in this regard.¹ The decisions handed down have been far from unanimous. Grote's famous dictum² has been followed in more recent

¹ The number of works containing discussions which bear more or less directly on this subject is very large. Without attempting to give a complete bibliography, I add here, for the convenience of the reader, those volumes or articles which I have particularly consulted and to which I most frequently refer in the following pages. K. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (2d ed.; Berlin and Leipzig, 1922), Vol. III, Part I; *Cambridge Ancient History* (New York, 1927), Vol. VI; P. Cloché, *La Politique étrangère d'Athènes* (Paris, 1934), and "La Politique de Démosthène de 354 à 346 avant J.-C." *BCH*, XLVII (1923), 97–162; M. Croiset, *Démosthène, Harangues* (Paris, 1924), Vols. I and II; E. Drerup, *Aus einer alten Advokatenrepublik* (Paderborn, 1916); G. Grote, *A History of Greece* (12 vols. ed.; London, 1869), Vols. XI and XII; J. Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (3d ed.; Leipzig, 1927), Vol. I; U. Kahrstedt, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden fünften und des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1910); J. Kessler, *Isokrates und die panhellenische Idee* (Paderborn, 1911); A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom* (New York and London, 1914); R. v. Pöhlmann, *Isokrates und das Problem der Demokratie* ("Sitzb. der k. bayer. Akad. der Wiss., Philos. Philol. u. Histor. Klasse" [Munich, 1913]), pp. 1–169; E. Pokorny, *Studien zur griechischen Geschichte im sechsten und fünften Jahrzehnt des vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Greifswald, 1913); P. Wendland, "Beiträge zu athenischer Politik und Publicistik des vierten Jahrhunderts; II. Isokrates und Demosthenes," *Nachrichten d. k. Gesellsch. der Wiss. zu Göttingen* (Berlin, 1910), pp. 289–323.

In the interim between the acceptance of this article and its publication, P. Cloché's *Démosthène et la fin de la démocratie athénienne* and W. Jaeger's *Demosthenes: The Origin and Growth of His Policy* have both appeared. Cloché (pp. 312 ff.) tends to follow the old view ascribing a general Panhellenic policy to Demosthenes. I cannot agree. Jaeger, abandoning the old attempt to see Demosthenes as everywhere the paladin of Panhellenism, traces much the same course as I should. He believes, however, that the orator's change to a Panhellenic viewpoint about the period of the *Third Philippic* is a true development of his policy and is sincere. I note the same change but question the sincerity.

² *Op. cit.*, XII, 151: "But what invests the purpose and policy of Demosthenes with peculiar grandeur, is, that they were not simply Athenian, but in an eminent degree Panhellenic also. It was not Athens alone which he sought to defend against Philip, but

years by others, such as Pickard-Cambridge,³ who have seen in Demosthenes an advocate of Panhellenism. On the other side, Drerup⁴ and Kaerst⁵ have denied that he had any true Panhellenic feeling.

Some of the reasons for this difference of opinion are not far to seek. The struggle between Demosthenes and Philip (or the contrast between the political views of Demosthenes and Isocrates), typifying for many the conflict between the democratic and monarchial types of government, has been carried on, in part, by the modern adherents to those systems. Enthusiastic democrats have attempted to add to the glory of Demosthenes the Athenian patriot by proclaiming him also as the champion of Panhellenic freedom; the opposing party, on the other hand, has found the hopes of Isocrates and the deeds of Philip more praiseworthy. Furthermore, this influence of contemporary political affairs particularly affected the German scholars of the early twentieth century, who have done much of the work in this field. The obvious advantages of the amalgamation of the small warring German states under the Prussian Empire greatly impressed them and inclined them to favor national union under a monarchy rather than the autonomy of small districts. As a result, these writers⁶ have tended, in general, to exalt Isocrates as one who attempted to teach this valuable lesson to the Greek states,⁷ and, in a measure, to belittle Demosthenes as the defender of the independent city-state.

the whole Hellenic world. In this he towers above the greatest of his predecessors for half a century before his birth—Perikles, Archidamus, Agesilaus, Epaminondas, whose policy was Athenian, Spartan, Theban, rather than Hellenic."

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 23: "He [Isocrates] expressed, as Demosthenes did (particularly in middle and later life), the strongest Panhellenic feeling."

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 111: "Aber dieser panhellenische Eifer des Demosthenes ist, im Gegensatz zu Isokrates, insofern unecht, als er nur als Mittel zu dem Zwecke dient, die athenischen Verbündeten gegen Makedonien aufzustacheln; für die eigentlichen Ziele des Demosthenes ist der Panhellenismus, der von ihm nur hier [i.e., the *Third Philippic*] als eine hohe, nationale Aufgabe gewertet wird, nichts als eine Pose." And see also his entire discussion of the *Third Philippic*, pp. 111–13.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, I, 223: "Nur sollte man seine Auffassung nicht eine nationale nennen und in ihm den Repräsentanten eines hellenischen oder panhellenischen Patriotismus sehen. Die panhellenischen Gefühle bilden nur den schmückenden Hintergrund, vor dem sich der spezifisch athenische Patriotismus des grossen Redners abhebt."

⁶ Beloch, Drerup, Kaerst, Kahrstedt, Kessler, Pöhlmann, and Wendland, with varying degrees of correctness in each individual case, may fairly be named in such a list, especially as regards their defense of Isocrates.

⁷ Undoubtedly, these studies have compelled us to give a fairer estimate of Isocrates and his work. Whether they have carried their admiration too far is another question.

Then too, the World War, in which democracy and autocracy were at least nominally concerned, aggravated this effect.⁸

In the second place, the evidence offered by Demosthenes' speeches is not wholly consistent, as the following pages will show; some of his statements seem to indicate that he was a wholehearted Panhellenist, others that he was a narrow Athenian patriot. The opposing "schools" have been prone to emphasize that set of quotations which seems best to prove their own contentions; but, so far as I know, no previous attempt has been made to study as a whole these apparently conflicting expressions of opinion on the part of the orator. The present study is, consequently, a consideration of this aspect of Demosthenes' political activity through an examination of the extant speeches,⁹ omitting as far as possible, the many vexed problems which do not properly fall within the scope of the present subject.¹⁰ Panhellenism was "in the air."¹¹ Was Demosthenes influenced by this sentiment, or was he only an Athenian patriot, desirous of local independence for his own city?

If we follow the orations in their chronological order, the speech *On the Symmories*, concerned as it is with the suspected invasion of Greece by Persia, offers the first statements pertinent to the present discussion. In part, Demosthenes' attitude here is severely realistic. He mentions several times that the relations of the Greek states, especially those of Athens with the other cities, are not of the best. Only too many of them would be led by grudges or self-interest to betray to the barbarian the cause of Greece.¹² For that reason, Athens should

⁸ Drerup very obviously wrote under war influence.

⁹ Although I consider the orations more as "speeches" than "pamphlets," the question is not important here. So Drerup, *op. cit.*, p. 61. See also C. Adams, "Are the Political 'Speeches' of Demosthenes To Be Regarded as Political Pamphlets?" *TAPA*, XLIII (1912), 5-22. For the position Demosthenes as a practical statesman would be forced to take as compared with Isocrates, a pamphleteer, see below, n. 89.

¹⁰ Discussion of whether Macedonian hegemony was better for Greece than her continual civil war, whether the Greeks of the period were capable of the proper use of freedom or of making the effort which Demosthenes demanded, and even whether the orator himself was a sincere patriot will be avoided. Our purpose is only to determine whether Demosthenes' views and policies, as expressed, were Panhellenic. A decision on this question will bring more light to the study of those problems than they to this.

¹¹ Beloch (*op. cit.*, III, Part I, 515-25) gives a good brief summary of the evidence for Panhellenic sentiment in the fifth century. For the fourth century, in addition to the works on Isocrates cited above (especially Kessler), see Kaerst, *op. cit.*, I, 138-53.

¹² xiv. 3-5, 12, 36-38. References are to the text of Butcher in the Oxford Classical Library.

not stir up a war scare now but should make her own preparations and wait for Persia to take the initiative. Demosthenes professes to feel that under those circumstances Athens could be sure of Greek support. To be sure, part of this co-operation would be secured through the desire of the other cities for Athenian arms and aid.¹³ But at the same time, the orator does not base his hopes completely on this self-interest. Although the Great King might gather a large force of Greek mercenaries for action in Egypt or Asia Minor, he could not persuade a Greek to fight against Greece:

For where would he retire afterwards? Will he go to Phrygia and be a slave? For the objects at stake in a war against the barbarian are nothing less than our country, our life, our habits, our freedom, and all such blessings. Who, then, is so desperate that he will sacrifice himself, his ancestors, his sepulchres, and his native land, all for the sake of paltry profit?¹⁴

Even Thebes, who failed Greece in the former invasion, is likely to fight on the right side.¹⁵ In short, that Greeks fighting in the hire of Persia should assist in the invasion of Greece is unthinkable; and the basis for this hope is reliance on Panhellenic spirit. This recognition of ethnic unity was not uncommon among the Greeks; but it had failed to prevent mutual hatred and jealousy and to unite the Greeks in any active way. Consequently, the orator does not stop with merely the idealistic recognition of Greek unity: he shows that this co-operation conferred practical benefits. Greece as a whole profited from the former instance of united effort against Persia.¹⁶ Of Athens this fact was particularly true since her activities then on behalf of Greece had been the beginnings of her supremacy.¹⁷ In the present crisis too, unselfish action may, secondarily, bring her private gain. But, primarily, Athens must take thought for Greece because it is her Panhellenic duty to preserve the freedom of the Greeks:

For indeed, as regards your policy towards the King, I see that you are by no means on the same footing as the other Greeks; for many of them it is, I suppose, possible to pursue their private interests and abandon the cause of

¹³ xiv. 13.

¹⁴ xiv. 31–32. And cf. xiv. 40. This translation and all those following are taken from the volumes of the Loeb Classical Library; orations i–xvii and xx are translated by J. H. Vince; orations xviii and xix, by C. A. and J. H. Vince.

¹⁵ xiv. 33–34.

¹⁶ xiv. 35–36.

¹⁷ xiv. 40.

their fellow-countrymen, but for you, even when wronged by them, it would not be honourable to exact such a penalty from the wrong-doers as to leave any of them under the heel of the barbarian.¹⁸

Demosthenes, in this speech, has two different points in regard to Panhellenism. First, if Persia attacks, Greece will unite in defense of the fatherland,¹⁹ impelled by Panhellenic feeling.²⁰ Second, under these circumstances, Athens must, as her Panhellenic duty, protect Greece. Yet both of these sentiments have one point in common: they are pious hopes for the future. Although rumor had it that the king was making preparations against Greece, the invasion was still only a rumor. Hence, the orator's Panhellenic sentiment is not directed toward a present fact. For the immediate need he offers his navy bill, a reform which would primarily strengthen Athens. Although this new power might be used on behalf of the other Greeks, it might well be turned against them if they misbehave.²¹ As a result, from this speech we cannot determine whether Demosthenes does have a sincere regard for the Greek states as a whole or whether his remarks are only bombast.

The next speech, that *On Behalf of the Megalopolitans*, does not exhibit even this ambiguous Panhellenic attitude, but is openly Athenian in tone. The Megalopolitans, allies of Thebes, had appealed to Athens for protection against the threatened encroachment of her ally, Sparta. That Demosthenes has the interest of Athens chiefly in mind is clearly stated by the speaker himself at the beginning of his address.²² He then sets forth exactly what, in his opinion, this interest demands.

Now no one would deny that our city is benefited by the weakness of the Lacedemonians and of the Thebans yonder. The position of affairs, then, if one may judge from statements repeatedly made in your Assembly, is such

¹⁸ xiv. 6.

¹⁹ He chooses here to ignore those sundering hates and hopes which he has himself mentioned (see above, n. 12).

²⁰ Since Demosthenes asserts that operations against Persia would unite the Greeks, the interesting question arises of how much the youthful Demosthenes may have been influenced by the writings of Isocrates (cf. Wendland, *op. cit., passim*; Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 525). One striking difference, however, has already been pointed out (C. D. Adams, *CP VII* [1912], 319): Isocrates planned an offensive war against Persia; Demosthenes seems to have felt that only the necessity of defense would unite the Greeks.

²¹ xiv. 5, 10-11, 41.

²² xvi. 1-4.

that the Thebans will be weakened by the refounding of Orchomenos, Thespiae, and Plataea, but the Lacedemonians will regain their power, if they get Arcadia into their hands and destroy Megalopolis. Our duty, then, is to take care lest the Lacedemonians grow strong and formidable before the Thebans are weaker, and lest their increase in power should, unperceived by us, outbalance the diminution of the power of Thebes, which our interests demand. For this at least we should never admit, that we would sooner have the Lacedemonians for our rivals than the Thebans, nor is that our serious aim, but rather to put it out of the power of either to do us harm, for in that way we shall enjoy the most complete security.²³

In other words, while Sparta must be prevented from making capital out of Thebes' embarrassment with the Sacred War, on the other hand, Thebes too should be weakened further by the restoration of Thespiae and the other Boeotian towns, with Athens taking due care that 'this strength taken from Thebes is not given to Sparta'.²⁴ In short, Demosthenes is not urging a policy of "balance of power"²⁵ but hopes so to weaken both Thebes and Sparta that Athens may be supreme in Greece. Although a decision as to whether this advice was best for Greece under the circumstances does not lie within the province of this study,²⁶ we must note that the orator's argument is distinctly not Panhellenic. Thebes and Sparta are not considered as parts of the Hellenic aggregate; they are merely cities whose power restricts or menaces the complete independence of the speaker's city. The Arcadians, or the Thespians and Plataeans, are not fellow-Greeks whose aspirations and liberties are considered; they are simply pawns in the game of inter-Hellenic politics. Here Demosthenes is not a Hellenic, but an Athenian patriot.

In the *First Philippic* about a year later, the orator adopts much the same tone. When he laments that a Macedonian is settling the affairs of Greece, his prior concern is that this Macedonian is triumphing over Athens.²⁷ Pydna, Potidaea, and Methone are not considered

²³ xvi. 4-5. This same point is stated even more clearly in xxiii. 102.

²⁴ xvi. 24-26, 30-31.

²⁵ So Cloché (*La Politique étrangère*, p. 183) rightly. A policy of balance of power would mean the recognition of equal Theban and Spartan power of admitted superiority, with Athens shifting to keep the balance even. Or at best, if Athens is not to be a mere make-weight, the phrase would denote a tripart division of power. In my opinion, neither of these is the orator's plan.

²⁶ See Grote's admission, however, *op. cit.*, XI, 94-95.

²⁷ iv. 10: Μακεδών ἀνήρ Ἀθηναίους καταπολεμῶν καὶ τὰ τῶν Ἐλλήνων διοικῶν.

as Greek cities whose freedom has been threatened or destroyed. They are spoken of almost as property which the Athenians once possessed but lost through neglect.²⁸ Such an attitude as this bespeaks Athenian imperialism, not Panhellenism.

Speaking *On the Liberty of the Rhodians*,²⁹ Demosthenes again uses strong language against the other Greeks.³⁰ At the same time, he does appeal to Panhellenic sentiment. If the Great King does lay claim to Rhodes, Athens must take counsel not for Rhodes alone but for herself and for all the Greeks.³¹ Athens must then seek to be recognized as the champion of general Hellenic freedom.³² But what kind of champion will Athens be? That the actual results may not be so idealistic as the phrase implies, Demosthenes himself seems to hint:

For I notice that all men have their rights conceded to them in proportion to the power at their disposal. . . . Of private rights within a state, the laws of that state grant an equal and impartial share to all, weak and strong alike; but the international rights of Greek states are defined by the strong for the weak.³³

Holding these views, the orator would hardly have Athens be an idealistic champion of Greece. This attitude points more toward another Athenian empire, a scheme which had already twice met resistance and failure.

Passing over the speech *On Organization*,³⁴ we come to the three *Olynthiacs*, which may well be treated as a unit. Here the orator includes a few touches which might be called Panhellenism. Philip is a barbarian³⁵ and as such should be ruled by Greeks, not be their ruler.³⁶ The Athenians should be ashamed to allow Philip to enslave

²⁸ iv. 4–6. This “objective” manner of regarding fellow-Greeks is similar to that of the preceding speech.

²⁹ For convenience I have followed the traditional date, 351 B.C.

³⁰ xv. 14–16.

³¹ xv. 13. οὐ γάρ ὑπέρ Ροδίων βουλευτέον . . . ἀλλ' ὑπέρ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν πάντων Ἑλλήνων.

³² xv. 30.

³³ xv. 29.

³⁴ Although its authenticity is now more generally accepted, it offers nothing particularly pertinent to the present question.

³⁵ iii. 16.

³⁶ iii. 24. For this thought, deeply rooted in the Greek mind, see Euripides *And.* 663–66; *I.A.* 1400–1401; *Tro.* 971–74; frag. (Nauck) 719.

Greek cities.³⁷ But the same breath which brands Philip as a barbarian labels the Greek cities which he holds not distressed brethren but lost or stolen property.³⁸ The seizure and trading of cities, a game at which Philip bested Athens, is censured because the Athenians were not clever enough to win or did not play the game with sufficient zeal.³⁹ In these *Olynthiacs*, delivered to arouse Athens to the defense of a city attacked by Philip, Demosthenes had a fine opportunity to stress Panhellenism. Even if the "imperialistic" attitude which he adopts may have seemed more practical, it is little short of surprising that more of his appeal does not rest on Panhellenism.

In his discussion *On the Peace*, Demosthenes still has little hope of Greek unity. Far from striving to be accepted as the champion of Greek freedom,⁴⁰ Athens must now seek to avoid an Amphictyonic war in which the various cities might merge their private grudges.⁴¹ And in the *Second Philippic*, which follows shortly, his opinion of the other Greek states is no higher. Thebes, Argos, and Messene are all willing, partially out of cupidity, partially out of stupidity, to sacrifice Greece to Philip if only they may gain some concession to their own interests.⁴² The speaker spares no words in denouncing them. But what has he to say of Athens? Philip is hostile to her because he rightly saw that to our city and our national character he could offer nothing, he could do nothing, that would tempt you from selfish motives to sacrifice to him any of the other Greek states, but that you, reverencing justice, shrinking from the discredit involved in such transactions, and exercising a due and proper forethought, would resist any such attempt on his part. . . . For by those very acts you stand judged the one and only power in the world incapable of abandoning the common rights of the Greeks at any price, incapable of bartering your devotion to their cause for any favour or profit.⁴³

In other words, Athens is and will be, Demosthenes says, the champion of Greek liberty; she cannot be tempted from this position by the wiles of the enemy or driven from it by the unwillingness or ingratitude of the Greeks.⁴⁴ Is the orator serious here? Aside from a

³⁷ iii. 20.

³⁸ iii. 16 (see above, n. 28).

³⁹ i. 8-9; ii. 6-7. Cf. xix. 22; viii. 15-16.

⁴⁰ This had been his suggestion in an earlier speech (xv. 30).

⁴¹ v. 14-19 particularly. ⁴² vi. 9-12, 19. ⁴³ vi. 7-10.

⁴⁴ The second point he made in an earlier speech (xiv. 6).

certain playing upon the vanity of the Athenians, does Demosthenes really feel that they have anything but a selfish interest in the affairs of Greece? Or is this statement mere flattery of the same order as references to Marathon and Salamis? One is inclined to believe the latter. In this same speech, referring to the surrender of the Phocians and Thermopylae to Philip, Demosthenes says that his objections were of no avail because the Athenians believed that Philip was hostile to Thebes and that by restoring Plataea and Thespiae he would further weaken this rival of Athens.⁴⁵ This admission certainly shows that, in regard to Thebes at least, Athenian Panhellenism was not fervid. Nor does Demosthenes state expressly here that he objected because the policy implied in the promises of the other envoys was un-Panhellenic: he finds fault because the results endangered Athens.⁴⁶ If these two expressions show Athenian feeling and the orator's personal attitude, his eloquent exposition of Athens' championship of Greek liberty rings slightly hollow.

Our doubts as to Demosthenes' Panhellenic feelings are increased by the oration *On the Chersonese*. Philip's subjugation of Greek cities is again represented only as the theft of Athenian property.⁴⁷ But even worse, in another speech⁴⁸ in which the orator attempts to gain Athenian aid for Greek communities, he does not base his appeal on Panhellenic motive at all. Athens must rescue these people, even though they have been foolish—but not for their sakes or for Greek freedom but in the interest of Athens.⁴⁹

After this unabashed expression of self-interest, the *Third Philippic* presents a surprising change of front. Demosthenes still realizes that the mutual relations of the Greek states are far from happy.⁵⁰ He even admits that perhaps the earlier supremacies of Athens, Sparta, and Thebes did commit some offenses against the subject states.⁵¹ Be that as it may, however, the time has now come for Athens to act on behalf of all Greece.⁵² So had their ancestors, of glorious memory, concerned

⁴⁵ vi. 29–30. The same point is made in ix. 11 and xix. 20–21.

⁴⁶ Cf. above, n. 39.

⁴⁷ viii. 6. Cf., also, iv. 4–6; iii. 16; xix. 22.

⁴⁸ The same general situation existed in regard to the *Olynthiacs* too.

⁴⁹ viii. 15–16.

⁵⁰ ix. 21, 28–29.

⁵¹ ix. 22–25.

⁵² ix. 19–20.

themselves with Greek affairs.⁵³ Now again Athens must assume the leadership. Not only must she send embassies to arouse and organize the other cities but she must herself take action to show that she will do her full share in protecting her own interests and those of Greece.⁵⁴ This Panhellenic emphasis of the much admired *Third Philippic* has probably influenced greatly those who would ascribe to Demosthenes a Panhellenic viewpoint. In the speech itself nothing contradicts these expressions or shows that the speaker was not sincere. Only the abrupt change in tone from that of the preceding speeches would lead us to believe that here Demosthenes' Panhellenic sentiment was but a veil for local Athenian patriotism and that he sought to save the Greek cities only because by protecting them could he preserve Athens. As a result, the sentiment of this speech can best be considered in the examination of his entire policy⁵⁵ when we have completed our chronological survey of his extant public orations.⁵⁶

The next oration, that *On the Embassy*, also has its Panhellenic touches. Demosthenes refers at some length to the patriotic oratory of Aeschines, who felt that he was the first to see the peril of Greece.⁵⁷ Then he gives equal emphasis to the changed and un-Hellenic attitude later adopted by this same orator.⁵⁸ At the same time Demosthenes himself delivers a patriotic harangue filled with memories of Marathon

⁵³ ix. 45, 74.

⁵⁴ ix. 70-74.

⁵⁵ Cf. below, p. 305.

⁵⁶ Although chronologically the *Fourth Philippic* should be considered next, its doubtful authenticity (cf. F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* [2d ed.; Leipzig, 1893], III, Part I, 384-92; Croiset, *op. cit.*, II, 112-19) makes it perhaps unfair to include this speech in the main body of the evidence. On the other hand, for most of the points which concern us here this speech affords not so much new evidence as confirmation of statements already made. The affairs of Greece are in disorder (x. 50-51). Athens shares in this mutual jealousy and distrust (x. 52-54). This state of affairs has come about because Athens has deserted the post of guardian of Greece, a trust left to her by the Athenians of old, and has sought her own ease and interest (x. 25, 46-48). One critical point is, however, the orator's advocacy of an alliance with Persia (x. 31-34; he had already suggested an embassy in the "longer version" of the *Third Philippic*, ix. 71). This attempt to win the support of the traditional enemy of Greece has been censured as un-Hellenic and unpatriotic (e.g., Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, Part I, 551) and has furnished material for those who wish to make Demosthenes a Persian agent (e.g., Drerup, *op. cit.*, p. 147). One cannot, however, thus categorically denounce the orator for this suggestion. That Greece was in less danger from Persia than from Macedonia was probably true. If Demosthenes was simply playing one enemy off against a stronger, his attempt to win Persian support does not necessarily convict him of being un-Hellenic (see Cloché, *BCH*, XLIV [1920], p. 146 and n. 2; *ibid.*, XLVI [1922], p. 161).

⁵⁷ xix. 10-12, 302-6.

⁵⁸ xix. 16, 307-8, 311.

and Salamis,⁵⁹ and stating Athens' position as champion of Greece.⁶⁰ From this fanfare one might be convinced that the emphasis of the speech was to be upon the Panhellenic duty of Athens toward the Phocians, whose betrayal forms the basis of Demosthenes' charges. He begins his statement of the Phocian question by reporting the speech which Aeschines is supposed to have delivered on his return from the embassy. This address contained the promises dear to Athenian hearts: that Thespiae and Plataea would be restored to weaken Thebes,⁶¹ which would be humbled further by having the guilt of the Sacred War fastened on her, that Amphipolis would be traded to Philip for Euboea,⁶² and that perhaps some lost property⁶³ (i.e., Oropos) would be recovered.⁶⁴ Now although these projects were not Panhellenic, they pleased the Athenians, who refused to hear contradictions, even from Demosthenes.⁶⁵ But many of these propositions were also quite in line with the policy of Demosthenes. Weakening Thebes, restoring the Boeotian towns (not for their own sakes but to injure Thebes), trading Amphipolis, and recovering property, all these hopes, even if they did run counter to ideal Panhellenic policy, had been cherished by Demosthenes.⁶⁶ His action against Aeschines was not apparently motivated by the fact that he opposed the nature of the promises, but by the fact that he thought Philip would fail to keep them.⁶⁷ In regard to these measures which were open to consideration on Panhellenic grounds, Demosthenes seems to have acted only as an Athenian.

In regard to the Phocians themselves, he waxes particularly warm.⁶⁸ One is almost led to believe that part, at least, of his indig-

⁵⁹ xix. 271–72, 312–13.

⁶⁰ xix. 64.

⁶⁴ xix. 20–22.

⁶¹ Cf. above, n. 45.

⁶⁵ xix. 24, 35, 74, 111–12.

⁶² Cf. above, n. 39.

⁶⁶ Cf. above, nn. 45, 39, and 47.

⁶³ Cf. above, n. 47.

⁶⁷ xix. 17, 24, 29, and cf. above, n. 39.

⁶⁸ xix. 47, 51, 66. The question of whether we can accept Demosthenes' statements in regard to his efforts to prevent the exclusion of the Phocians from the Peace concerns us only indirectly; however, cf. *CAH*, VI, 248. Even Grote (*op. cit.*, XI, 204–5) is forced to admissions. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that in this speech of defense Demosthenes does not employ any Panhellenic argument for their inclusion in the treaty.

nation at their fate is due to a feeling for them as fellow-Greeks. But the orator clearly states his point of view:

Yet no man could point out two places in the whole world of more importance to the commonwealth [$\pi\delta\lambda\epsilon$] than Thermopylae by land and the Hellespont by sea; and both of them these men have infamously sold and delivered into the hands of Philip.⁶⁹

You all know that the prowess of the Phocians, and their control of the pass of Thermopylae, gave us security against the Thebans, and ensured that neither Philip nor the Thebans would invade either the Peloponnesus, or Euboea, or Attica.⁷⁰

You saved the Lacedaemonians in old time, and those accursed Euboeans lately, and many other people, not because they were virtuous, but because their safety profited Athens, as that of the Phocians would today.⁷¹

Our orator is apparently no more worried about the Phocians as Greeks than he is about "those accursed Euboeans." They are to be saved not because they are Greeks who should be free but because their safety benefits Athens. Although Demosthenes may at one moment shout about the Panhellenic duty of Athens toward the other states of Greece, his other remarks frequently force us to admit that he preserved, or sought to preserve, Greek cities, not so much as free states for Greece as buffer states for Athens.

Much this same attitude appears in the account of his political life, the speech *On the Crown*. Here again Demosthenes stresses his Panhellenic policy. Beginning his career, he took Hellenic affairs as his province.⁷² For one in that position, when Philip began his advance upon Greece, only one course of action, in Demosthenes' opinion, was open. The rest of Greece was split into factions with many of the leading states eager to betray the Hellenic cause in the hope of selfish profit.⁷³ In this situation, Athens alone could stand forth as the champion of Greece.⁷⁴ Nor did this Panhellenic zeal of

⁶⁹ xix. 179-80.

⁷⁰ xix. 83.

⁷¹ xix. 75. With the "accursed Euboeans" [$\kappa\alpha\tau\rho\acute{a}tovs\ E\acute{v}\beta\acute{o}\acute{e}\acute{s}$] of this speech may be compared the "vile Thessalians" and "ill-conditioned Thebans" (xviii. 43: $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{a}\pi\tau\nu\sigma\acute{t}\acute{o}\acute{s}\ \Theta\acute{e}\tau\tau\alpha\acute{l}\acute{o}\ k\acute{a}\l\acute{a}\acute{v}\alpha\acute{\lambda}\theta\acute{\eta}\acute{t}\acute{o}\acute{s}\ \Theta\acute{e}\tau\tau\alpha\acute{l}\acute{o}\acute{s}$).

⁷² xviii. 58-59. ⁷³ xviii. 43-44, 61-64. Cf. xiv. 3-5, 12, 36-38. ⁷⁴ xviii. 64, 71-72.

Athens spring only from the counsels of Demosthenes.⁷⁵ The city from her earliest history had sought to defend the freedom of Greece as well as her own power and renown.⁷⁶ Neither in the earlier days nor under the orator's sway did Athens scruple to lend aid. That the other cities could not or would not do their full share⁷⁷ or that Athens had some grievance against those who sought her help⁷⁸ never deterred the city from her duty. This traditional policy of Athens Demosthenes maintained in a manner worthy both of the city and of himself.⁷⁹ Those cities which followed the advice of Demosthenes were saved;⁸⁰ and, had every city produced one such patriot, they would have preserved their independence.⁸¹

Although the activity which Demosthenes sets forth⁸² may be termed Panhellenic in the sense that it was an effort to protect Greek communities, one wonders, as in regard to the preceding speech, whether they were saved for their own sakes or for Athens'. Certainly, the orator claims much credit for the benefits which his policy conferred upon the city. He protected the Attic frontier both on land and on sea, he insured the delivery of grain, secured places already under Athenian control, made alliances with new strategic points, won allies, and, finally, brought it about that the invasion of Greece ended in a battle not on Attic soil.⁸³

I did not fortify Athens with masonry and brickwork: they are not the works on which I chiefly pride myself. Regard my fortifications as you ought, and you will find armies and cities and outposts, seaports and ships and horses, and a multitude ready to fight for their defense. These were the bastions I planted for the protection of Attica so far as it was possible to human forethought; and therewith I fortified, not the ring-fence of our port and citadel, but the whole country.⁸⁴

From this chronological summary of Demosthenes' Panhellenic utterances, one easily sees why opinions on this phase of the orator's policy have been divided. Some of his statements seem to show that he was moved by Panhellenic sentiment; at the same time, other ex-

⁷⁵ xviii. 293.

⁸⁰ xviii. 80.

⁷⁶ xviii. 66, 100–101, 203–5, 208.

⁸¹ xviii. 304–5.

⁷⁷ xviii. 237–38.

⁸² xviii. 79, 237–38.

⁷⁸ xviii. 96–101.

⁸³ xviii. 229–30, 300–303.

⁷⁹ xviii. 108–9.

⁸⁴ xviii. 299–300.

pressions offer a basis for the contrary decision. Admitting this apparent contradiction, we can, nevertheless, arrive at certain conclusions in regard to Demosthenes' Panhellenic attitude. First, in Demosthenes we miss that broad sympathy with the points of view taken by other Greek cities and individuals which we should expect in one whose professed policy was the championship of Hellas.⁸⁵ Instead of understanding and respect, he expresses distrust and even contempt for them and their policies.⁸⁶ Second, he surprises us in that on several occasions when he could have used Panhellenic appeal very pertinently and effectively, he either almost omits any mention of such claims,⁸⁷ or, in spite of some Panhellenic touches, he appears to adopt an attitude more appropriate to an Athenian imperialist.⁸⁸ In the latter case, the fact that he does make some use of Panhellenic sentiment shows that he was not simply taking a more "practical" rather than an idealistic view for the purpose of carrying his point.⁸⁹ Third, many of his Panhellenic expressions refer either to Panhellenic activity in the glorious past,⁹⁰ or else to a future, and sometimes hypothetical, position which Athens might take.⁹¹ But when it is a question

⁸⁵ E.g., the tolerance implied by Aristophanes in *Acharnians* 509–22.

⁸⁶ xiv. 3–5, 12, 36–38, 41; v. 14–19; vi. 9–12, 19; viii. 15–16; xix. 75; xviii. 43.

⁸⁷ E.g., in the speech *On Behalf of the Megalopolitans*.

⁸⁸ E.g., the *First Philippic*, *On the Liberty of the Rhodians*, *Second Philippic*, and the three *Olynthiacs*.

⁸⁹ As has already been stated (p. 293), this study attempts to limit itself to the evidence offered by the extant public orations. One additional point, however, deserves consideration, even though its treatment must be brief. Some defense of the orator's lack of Panhellenism might be made to this effect. Demosthenes was not (particularly if we accept the "speeches" as speeches) writing a commentary on the political events of his day. He was a man of affairs endeavoring to get measures, often unpopular ones, through a legislative body against opposition. As a result, although his personal beliefs may have been of higher or more idealistic type, he used more "realistic" arguments to win the support of those whom expediency and self-interest would convince more than ideals. (The *locus classicus* for this technique is, of course, the speech of Diodotus [Thuc. iii. 42–48].) Being in this position, then, Demosthenes would be less able to express Panhellenic sentiment than Aristophanes was in his plays or Isocrates in his pamphlets. This argument might partially explain a total lack of this sentiment in the speeches; but the reality is, of course, that Demosthenes does use some Panhellenic appeal. It is the fact that he employs this sentiment inconsistently, sporadically, and sometimes not at all which leads us to believe that he was not a Panhellenist whose position prevented his fully expressing his opinions but an Athenian patriot who sometimes found appeal to Panhellenic sentiment useful.

⁹⁰ ix. 19–20, 45, 74; xiv. 35–36, 40; xviii. 66, 96–101, 203–5, 208, 237–38.

⁹¹ xiv. 6; xv. 13, 30.

of some immediate action toward which a Panhellenic attitude might be adopted, our orator either makes but little use of Panhellenic appeal or else goes on a completely different tack and pleads Athenian interest.

This constant emphasis on Athenian interests is what impresses us most. In the speech *On the Symmories*, Athens, whatever her future action, will have new strength. By the policy urged on behalf of the Megalopolitans Athens will weaken her rivals. In the case of the Rhodians Athenian democracy must have its interest guarded,⁹² and in this speech as well as several of the following orations⁹³ Athenian imperialism seems implied. Demosthenes, in the *Embassy* and the *Crown*, claims that he did much to unite Greece; but apparently he did it to save Athens. Even the Panhellenism of the *Third Philippic* appears inspired by Athenian patriotism. In short, Demosthenes did use Panhellenic appeal. But he did not, in my opinion, have a true Panhellenic feeling. Athens was his *patris*, and he sought to save it as a city-state. If he attempted to unite Greece or appealed to Panhellenic sentiment, he did so only because he felt that thereby he could save Athens. Demosthenes was an Athenian, not a Panhellenist.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

⁹² Cf. also xiii. 7-9.

⁹³ The six orations cited (see above, n. 88).

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

TWO HOMERIC ECHOES

On *Iliad* xiv. 16, the well-known simile comparing Nestor's slow pondering to a κωφὸν κῆμα, some of the scholiasts (B and T) note that this type of wave is known as κολόκυμα in Attic and σκώληξ in Aeolic. Plato Comicus (Kock, 25), Hesychius, and Suidas confirm the latter usage. Presumably the slowly undulating movement of both "worm" and "wave" formed the semantic link between such apparently diverse applications of the term σκώληξ. It has not, I think, been noticed that this explanation is extraordinarily well illustrated, either deliberately or unconsciously, by Apollonius Rhodius in *Argonautica* iv. 150. He is describing how the serpent that guards the Golden Fleece languidly relaxes its coils under the influences of Medea's spell:

μήκυνε δὲ μυρία κύκλα
οἷον ὅτε βληχροῖσι κυλινδόμενον πελάγεσσιν
κῦμα μέλαν κωφὸν τε καὶ ἄβρομον. . . .

The Homeric imitation in the simile is obvious, and for once Apollonius perhaps improves on his original in aptness and phrasing. But did the *doctus poeta* intend something more than epic coloring, namely, a subtle philological pun equating the Colchian *Lindwurm* with the Aeolic σκώληξ? Even if he did not, his comparison is interesting as showing a poetic rediscovery of a similarity once generally recognized by most users of the Aeolic dialect.

Commentators on Theocritus ii. 82, χῶς ἵδον ὡς ἐμάνην, ὡς μοι περὶ θυμὸς ἱάφθη, and iii. 42, ὡς ἵδεν, ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐβαθὺν ἀλλατ' ἔρωτα, find it hard to explain the construction of the triple ὡς. The scholiast cites *Iliad* xix. 16, ὡς εἴδ', ὡς μιν μᾶλλον ἔδι χόλος. Cholmeley (London, 1919) and Kynaston (Oxford, 1892) add *Il.* xx. 424, ὡς εἴδ', ὡς ἀνετᾶλπτο; Moschus ii. 74, ἡ γὰρ δὴ Κρονίδης ὡς μιν φράσαθ' ὡς ἑλῆτο θυμόν; *Od.* xvii. 218, ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν δμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ὡς τὸν δμοῖον (a regrettable slip by Cholmeley, since the second ὡς here is clearly a preposition), and some other less noteworthy examples. They also mention, but without comment or emphasis, *Il.* xiv. 294, ὡς δ' ἵδεν, ὡς μιν ἔρως πυκινὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν (from the Διὸς ἀπάτη). Cholmeley acutely remarks, "The passages are so curiously alike that a single explanation of them all seems required." He tries to find some syntactical explanation, without much success. But he ignores a matter of some literary interest. *Il.* xiv. 294 is demonstrably the prototype of the lines in Theocritus and Moschus, and through them of Virgil *Ecl.* viii. 41 and Ovid *Her.* xii. 33; first, because Theocritus has closely imitated the rhythms of that line of Homer with caesura, diaeresis, and quantity strikingly alike, his only variation being the spondee in the

third foot, and Virgil and Ovid carefully preserve the pattern; second, because, although Homer has not the triple ως, yet the last syllable of his ἔρως is likely to have suggested it to Theocritus' ear; and, third, because the Διὸς ἀπάτη would naturally be the familiar archetype for all subsequent hexameter versions of erotic themes. This last consideration shows why Moschus varied the rhythm; the situation between Zeus and Europa in his poem so much resembled that between Zeus and Hera in the *Iliad* that some verbal variation of the stock phrase was demanded. Even in Homer's time ως ἴδεν, ως μν̄ ἔρως was probably recognized as an adaptation of a stereotyped current proverb or catchword for "love at first sight." Its rhythm and jingle seem to indicate this. *Il.* xix. 16 and xx. 424 are, then, only repetitions out of its erotic content of this motif, perhaps adding grimness by their deliberate misuse in reference to sudden anger instead of affection.

Thus the unity which Cholmeley desires can be established on literary grounds. The syntax, however, remains uncertain. But if, as I suggest, a proverb originated the phrase, then loose syntax would not be unusual.

W. BEDELL STANFORD

TRINITY COLLEGE
DUBLIN

ON AGAMEMNON 50

49 τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν οἵτ' ἐκπατλοῖς
50 ἀλγεῖσι παιδῶν ὑπατοὶ λεχέων
51 στροφοδινοῦνται

Many editors are quite satisfied with line 50. Let those who agree with them ignore this note. But Housman and Headlam reject the genitive λεχέων after ὑπατοῖ as incapable of meaning "very high above their nests." Headlam offered ὑπατηλεχέων as an emendation—a new formation involving alteration of the manuscripts. Verrall didn't mind the genitive but objected to παιδῶν, "young birds," and then, *more suo*, he set off chasing some ποτανὸν δρυν of Homeric breed which we may let alone. Nevertheless, Liddell and Scott and Stephanus give no other instance of παιῶν *tout court*, "young of animals." In the present context it is bold, to say the least of it.

If a change of interpretation is desirable, I suggest that λεχέων should be taken as an adjective with παιδῶν. With some diffidence I offer the following arguments for the possibility of such a form besides the established λεχαῖος.

The accepted form of adjective from λέχος, namely, λεχαῖος, is by no means of irreproachable pedigree. Excepting Lachmann's emendation of *Septem* 293, it doesn't occur until Apollonius Rhodius i. 1182. The only other clear instances I can find are Herodian περὶ καθ. προσῳδ., E. 23 (not cited in Liddell and Scott), and Theognostus 9. Lobeck unfortunately fails to notice it. The ending in -αῖος seems to me less to be expected than an ending with an -ε- base, such as λεχῆς (like ψευδῆς) or λέχειος with shortening λέχεος (as from τέλος; cf. χρυσός). Compounds, as Headlam shows, all have -λεχῆς. In order

to explain the two forms of the adjective, as I suppose there were, it would be simple to postulate a feminine form of the noun in *λέχη* (cf. similar forms *ἄγος*, *ἄγη*, *νάκος* -η, *βλάβος* -η, *ἄκος* -ή, *σκέπος* -η, *νέίκος* -η, *σκεῦος* -ή, *σκῆνος* -ή, *σκάφος* -η, *εὐχος* -ή, *γλῆνος* -η). *λεχαῖος* would then come from the feminine *λέχη* (but see Lobeck, *Phrynichi Eclogae*, p. 541). Or the fact that *λόχος* has *λοχαῖος*, *λοχεῖος*, and *λοχέος* may have suggested analogical forms from *λέχος*.

The passage in *Septem* 292-94 gives some support for my view:

292 δράκοντας ὡς τις τέκνων
 293 ὑπερόδοικεν λεχαῖων (Lachmann) δυσευνάτορας
 294 πάντρομος πελειάς

Both manuscripts and scholiast read *λεχέων*, but the meter demands a change. However, its retention by the scholiast and its interpretation as an adjective (*τουτέστι νεμομένων ἐπὶ τῆς καλλᾶς*) indicate that there was a known adjective *λέχειος*, -eos, or -ής, and perhaps *λεχεῖων* should be read here. The phrase *τέκνων λεχείων* may well have prompted *παιδῶν λεχέων* in the *Agamemnon*. Incidentally, at *Theogony* 178 there is a v.l. *λεχέοιο* to the accepted *λοχεοῖο*.

Unless there is some grammatical or philological objection, which I have overlooked, to *λεχέων* as an adjective, it would remove both the Housman-Headlam and the Verrall¹ objection to the phrase without alteration of text.

W. BEDELL STANFORD

TRINITY COLLEGE
DUBLIN

JEBB ON SOPHOCLES OT 1430-31

τοῦς ἐν γένει γάρ τάγγενη μάλισθ' ὅραν
μύροις τ' ἀκούειν εὐσεβῶς ἔχει κακά.

Professor W. H. Alexander (*Class. Phil.*, XXXIII, 89-90) takes issue with Jebb's note on these lines, arguing that *μάλιστα* goes with *τοῦς ἐν γένει*, not, as Jebb thinks, with *εὐσεβῶς ἔχει*. His argument is that Jebb's interpretation could not be made clear by a speaker on the stage, and he adds some stern words about critics who "construe" Greek drama and oratory silently, instead of testing their interpretations by reading it aloud, blaming (I know not why) English and Scotch scholars in particular for this failing.

He is a rash critic who attacks Jebb's interpretations; for disagreement with them often arises out of incomplete understanding, and there are very few scholars who had such a fine ear and such a sense for the subtleties of the Greek language as he had. Professor Alexander forgets what exacting demands Sophocles made upon both actors and audience with unusual arrangements of words like

οἵμοι τάλαινα· τίς δὲ τολμήσει κλύνων
τὰ τοῦδ' ἔπεσθαι τάνδρος, οἱ' θέσπισεν [OC 1427-28].

¹ Verrall objected to *παῖς* unqualified = "young of animals," but *λέχεος παῖς* obviously is quite unobjectionable (cf. *Pers.* 578, *ἀναβόων παιδῶν τὰς ἀμάντου*, "fishes").

He forgets also the other passages in Sophocles where *μάλιστα* seems oddly misplaced, added as it were parenthetically by the speaker and not qualifying the word or words in its immediate vicinity. I have not made an exhaustive search for such passages, but a cursory examination of the *OC* and *OT* reveals the following two:

Ἐνθα δίστομοι
μάλιστα συμβάλλουσιν ἐμπόρων ὅδοι [OC 900-901]

(where *μάλιστα* goes with *ἐνθα*—“about at the place where”), and more striking

ὅν ἔγώ μάλιστα μὲν
τὴν σὴν Ἐρινὸν αἰτίαν εἶναι λέγω·
Ἐπειτα κάπο μάντεων ταῦτη κλίνω [OC 1298-1300].

One is at first surprised at Jebb's remark that *μάλιστα* goes with *λέγω*, not *αἰτίαν*, but the *Ἐπειτα* in line 1300 following on the *μέν* shows he is right and that the meaning is “I am most inclined to say.” This is a very close parallel with the passage under discussion.

Though it is dangerous to draw up a rule of this kind, it would seem that *μάλιστα* in general qualifies the nearest preceding or following word on which emphasis is to be placed, as in *OT* 44-45

ὅς τοῖσιν ἔκπειροι καὶ τὰς ἔνυμφοράς
ζώσας δρῶ μάλιστα τῶν βουλευμάτων,

where *δρῶ* is not sufficiently emphatic or striking a word to prevent *μάλιστα* from qualifying *ζώσας*. But *τάγγενῆ* is a striking word and that is why Jebb thought its intervention ruled out the possibility of *μάλιστα* governing *τοῖς ἐν γένει* here. It follows, then, that it qualifies the whole sentence with the force of “if possible,” as in *Antig.* 327 *ἄλλ' εὐρεθείη μὲν μάλιστα*, which is another way of saying it governs the main verb, *εὐσεβῶς ἔχει*. And the actor, in order to make his meaning clear, would put the chief emphasis on *τοῖς ἐν γένει*; then his voice would sink until the end of the line and rise again to emphasize *μόνοις*, possibly making a very slight pause after *τάγγενῆ*. Such questions of Greek style invite endless discussion, but *μὴ ἐσ ἄγαν βαθὺ μάλιστ' ὅδωρ πέσω φοβοῦματα*.

LIONEL PEARSON

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA

PLAUTUS *CISTELLARIA* 290

AL.: *I, curre, equom adfer. SER.: Peri, hercle hic insanit miser.*

AL.: *Abi atque hastatos multos, multos velites,
multos cum multis—nil moror precario.*

Ubi sunt quae iussi? SER.: Sanus hic non est satis.

GY.: *Manu esse credo nocitum, quom illaec sic facit.* 290

SER.: *Utrum deliras, quaesito, an astans somnias,
qui equom me adferre iubes, loricam adducere. . . .*

In this passage, which is preserved in the Ambrosian palimpsest only, the phrase *manu esse credo nocitum* has given trouble. Ussing reads *vigilasse credo noctem*, while Leo emends *manu* to *ab anu*, making the words refer to Selenium's mother.¹ Of modern translators, Nixon ("Loeb Library" [1917]), Gurlitt (Berlin, 1922), and Przychocki (Cracow, 1935) follow Leo. Lindsay, Goetz-Schoell, and Ernout, however, retain *manu* in their editions, and Schoell notes that the words should be referred "ad superstitionem ex digitis mala tam inferri quam averti credentium." Ernout is apparently uncertain of the meaning, for though he translates the line "Pour agir comme il fait, il faut qu'on l'ait ensorcelé," he also suggests in a note the alternative rendering, "il faut qu'il ait le cerveau fêlé (par un coup)." Since Leo's emendation of the passage does not seem to have been discussed anywhere, a brief note is perhaps in order to show that *manu* is the true reading, and that the first of Ernout's two interpretations is certainly right.

We have here simply an illustration of the familiar idea that to be struck by an evil spirit may result in serious consequences, madness or death.² From the expressions *hic insanit, sanus non est, deliras*, it is evident that the slave thinks Alcesimarchus crazy, just as in *Merc.* 932 Eutychus doubts Charinus' sanity when he carries on in a similar fashion, and one would look for the same meaning in Gymnasium's words. Two close parallels, recently discussed by Schuster with references to Germanic folklore,³ may be cited. In Trimalchio's "ghost" story, the mourning for a boy that had just died was interrupted by the screeching of witches. A Cappadocian who was present rushed outdoors to do battle with the creatures and wounded one of them. When he came back, "corpus totum lividum habebat quasi flagellis caesus, quia scilicet illum tetigerat mala manus." After this experience the unfortunate man "numquam coloris sui fuit, immo post paucos dies phreneticus periit."⁴ The other passage is *Amph.* 552 ff. Sosia is trying to explain to his incredulous master that he seems to have been in two places at once and that, when he got home, he found himself there present already. Amphitruo at first thinks he is merely lying, then suggests that he is drunk or ill, and finally comes to the conclusion that he is crazy: AM.: Quas, malum, nugas? satin tu sanus es? So.: Sic sum ut vides. / AM.: Huic homini nescioquid est mali mala obiectum manu / postquam a me abiit" (604-6). The *Cist.* passage may then be translated, "I think he has been hurt by an [evil] hand."⁵ It may be objected that here *manu* stands alone, while elsewhere the phrase is *mala*

¹ *Gött. Nachr.*, 1894, pp. 203-4.

² Cf. *CLE* 987 = *CIL*, VI, 19747, 3-6; *ibid.*, 18817, 8; Friedländer's note on Petr. lxiii. 10, and Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder* ("Religiousgesch. Vers. u. Vor.", Vol. VIII, No. 1 [Giessen, 1909]), pp. 57-62.

³ *Wien. St.*, XLVIII (1930), 168-71; XLIX (1931), 86-87.

⁴ lxiii. 4-10.

⁵ *Noceo* is probably used transitively here, as in later Latin; cf. Leo, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

manu, but the idea of evil is contained in the verb *nocitum*, which not infrequently refers to magical practices.⁶

The bearing of Alcesimarchus' outburst is not clear; perhaps he intends to besiege Selenium's house and take her away by force,⁷ as in *Eun.* 771–90 Thraso pretends to make an attack upon Thaïs's house. Or he may be threatening to go off to war as does Charinus in *Merc.* 921 ff., which is probably a parody of the tragic Heracles,⁸ and in that case the *Cist.* passage may also be a tragic parody.

†DOROTHY PASCHALL

TEXAS STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

† Deceased.

LEXICON EURIPIDEUM

The undersigned intends to publish a Lexicon Euripideum containing all the words occurring in Euripides, the context of each word being given whenever necessary. Although he has already collected a considerable amount of material, he urgently invites the collaboration of all those interested in such studies. He will be grateful for any hint or piece of advice in general, but especially for the sending of papers referring to fragments of Euripides.

G. ITALIE

ROELOFSSTRAAT 18
THE HAGUE, HOLLAND

⁶ E.g., Ov. *Met.* x. 397–99: "Seu furor est, habeo, quae carmine sanet et herbis; / sive aliquis nocuit, magico lustrabere ritu; / ira deum sive est, sacris placabilis ira"; *Ars.* ii. 106: "Philtra nocent animis vimque furoris habent"; CLE 987, 3–4: "Eripuit me saga manus crudelis ubique, / cum manet in terris et nocit arte sua."

⁷ Studemund, *Stud. auf dem Gebiete d. arch. Lat.* (Berlin, 1873–91), II, 429.

⁸ T. Frank, *AJP*, LIII (1932), 246–48.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Homeric Hymns. Edited by T. W. ALLEN, W. R. HALLIDAY, and E. E. SIKES. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. \$8.75.

This is a beautiful book, considering the grave difficulties which confront an editor of the Hymns. There are no scholia, since the Alexandrians did not regard the Hymns as Homeric, and ancient quotations or allusions are relatively few. Thus far only one papyrus has come to light, and that gives only a few fragments from one hymn. Mr. Allen's text edition of the poems (Oxford, 1911), in which are explained the materials and principles upon which the editing of the text is based, is modestly mentioned in the Preface and in the last sentence of the Introduction. Though the number of known manuscripts has now increased from twenty-eight to thirty-one, the careful report of them in the 1904 edition, by a master in paleography, required but little change. A new section on prosody and a slightly expanded bibliography enrich this edition. The new format permitted the editors to use the same pagination for text and critical apparatus (even with additions), as in the Oxford text edition. Some ingenuity was required for this, e.g., the Latin note on *h. Herm.* 85 is transferred from the critical apparatus to the exegetical part in English. (In that note, by the way, the use of "toboggan" in the sense of snowshoe or mudshoe will seem odd to an American or Canadian reader.) On the other hand, some useful critical notes of the Oxford text have been omitted, e.g., *h. Herm.* 127. Occasionally the explanatory note is at variance with the critical note. On *h. Ap.* 20, where manuscript *vōμos* is now rightly altered to *vōμōs*, we read (p. 204): "There is further a doubt whether we should accept the MS. reading *vōμōs* or alter to *vōμos*."

Students who have read Mr. Halliday's essays and lectures on religion and folklore during the last ten years will welcome his introductions and notes to the various hymns. It is here that the largest expansions, as compared with the first edition, are to be found. Fantastic notions, both ancient and modern, are calmly waved aside, often with considerable humor. See, for example, the remarks on the etymology of Demeter (p. 114). The non-Athenian origin of the *h. Dem.* is asserted with greater emphasis than in the earlier edition, and the anthropological theories about corn fetishes are abandoned. For the date of the incorporation of Eleusis with the Athenian state, J. H. Wright, *HSCP*, III, 9, should be cited. The argument for the unity of *h. Ap.* is now stated with greater strength and conviction. The rejection, however, of the theory that the name Eleusis is connected with the base *eleuth-* (p. 125) seems too summary, considering the "Comer" legends of northern mythology. Indeed,

the work may be said to be least satisfactory on the linguistic side. On *h. Dem.* 111 (p. 143) we read ἔγνων = the Homeric ἔγνωσαν. Why Homeric any more than Aristophanic? ἔγνωσαν occurs only once in Homer (*Od. x.* 397). The discussion of χρυσάορος, *h. Dem.* 4, *h. Ap.* 395 is sensible, but Pindar *Pyth. v.* 97 with Puech's note (against Gildersleeve) might be added. For ἀμαλδύνοντα *h. Dem.* 94, the later ἀπαμαλδύνω might also be cited. It is true that "the verb νέω 'go' (*h. Dem.* 395) has a doubtful existence"; a clearer statement would be, "The active form νέω, etc.," since the deponent νέομαι is common enough.

A too positive assumption of 586 B.C. (p. 185) as the date when the Pythian Games were instituted takes no account of the date, 582, accepted by many historians (see Sandys, *Pindar*, p. viii). On herbs supposed to check sexual desire (p. 170) add Athenaeus 69 c-d.

This reviewer, at least, finds satisfaction in the editors' rejection of alleged Orphic influences and origins, e.g., for *h. Dionys.* vii. Even *h. Ares* (viii) is Alexandrian and astrological, not Orphic. The statement (p. 385) that the planet Mars is first mentioned in Plato's *Epinomis* should be qualified by the clear reference to the planet in *Rep.* 617 A.

Misprints and misplaced accents (the latter usually due to the English pronunciation of Greek) are refreshingly rare. Page 104 read πεδίον (not πέδιον); page 122 (*h. Ap.* 142) correct ἡλασκάζεις; page 320 (*h. Herm.* 285), read σκενάζοντα; page 149 read Ambas for Ambos (correctly given on p. 154); page 121, note 2, read Körte for Körtel. At page 108 read εἰς τὴν ἐν Ἐρμόνῃ (so Codex Marcaianus of Athenaeus) for εἰς τὴν Ἐρμόνη.

A facsimile of M (now called Mosquensis instead of Moscoviensis in preceding editions) fronts the title-page, and a Greek and an English Index conclude the work. Both omit some important words and names; nevertheless, the work is indispensable.

C. B. GULICK

Harvard University

The Rendel Harris Papyri. Edited with translation and notes by J. ENOCH POWELL. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1936. Pp. xii+134 with 5 plates. \$4.50.

The papyri here published originally constituted part of a private collection purchased from dealers in Cairo and Behnesa during the winter of 1922-23 by Dr. James Rendel Harris, at that time curator of manuscripts at the Rylands Library, Manchester. In 1925 the collection was presented to Woodbrooke College, Selly Oak, Birmingham, and is now in the central library of that college. Mention of the collection was first made in K. Preisendanz, *Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung*, page 300. A short account of the material contained in it, given by the editor before the International Congress of Papyrology in Florence (1935), was printed in *Aegyptus*, XVI (1936), 351.

The present volume "contains all the literary papyri, however fragmentary; but only those documents have been included which are either complete or interesting despite incompleteness." It is suggested by the editor that the collection be designated by the abbreviation P. Harr.

In the first section, "New and Unidentified Classical Fragments," are included thirty-five pieces, of which all except the first are too small to yield a connected and intelligible text. Number 1 (third century A.D.) consists of portions of two columns of 50 and 51 lines, the second at least being part of a dialogue in which one speaker urges the other to increase the size of his family, setting forth the advantages thereof.

Plates II-V, which reproduce all these fragments except No. 23, are of little practical value and might better have been devoted to some of the nonliterary pieces with which the editor experienced some difficulty in decipherment and interpretation.

Under "Extant Classical Authors" are found fragments of the *Iliad*; Euripides *Medea* and *Andromache*; Herodotus, Book viii; Thucydides, Book i, and Demosthenes *Philippic* iv and *De Corona*. Number 36, *Iliad* xii, which, without complete continuity, covers lines 355-458, shows some additional lines and other variations from the vulgate text. Number 43, Demosthenes *Philippic* iv. 10-12, shows a divergence from the accepted text in section 12. The editor there reads:

λογ[ι]εσθε αρχειν
βουλ[εται των Ελληνων]
νω[ν] γ[ιουντο δι αυτον]
ταγωμιστας νηας
υπειληφε μονον

Butcher's text (Oxford, 1903) reads: λογιζεσθε γάρ. ἀρχειν βούλεται, τούτον δ' ἀνταγωνιστὰς μόνους ὑπειληφεν ἡμᾶς.

The nonliterary papyri include the usual variety of documents and letters. It is in this section that the editor's lack of familiarity with the material and the procedure in treating it is most apparent. One notices a lack of consistency in method:

a) *In dealing with the abbreviation for ετος and cases.*—It is not resolved in 61. i. 4, 7, 8; 64. 6; 82. 10, but resolved in 69. i. 18, 19; 70. 12, 17; 71. 26, and elsewhere.

b) *In giving orthographic notes*, e.g., on ι for ει and ε for αι and vice versa. Compare 82, 28, δισης (for δεισης), without note, and 102. 2, π[λειστ]α (for π[λειστ]α) with note; 102. 3, ὑγιένιν (for ὑγιαινειν), with note, but 104. 9, μεμαίληκεν (for μεμέληκεν) without note. Other similar examples might be cited as well.

c) *In making citations.*—In the introduction to No. 64 reference is made to Wilcken, *Chrest.* No. 43 but in No. 94 to Wilcken, *Chrest.* 220. After some searching, the reference is found to be to No. 188 on page 220.

d) In the use of dots to indicate doubtful letters.—In 65. 8, *πρεσθυρεγλημ..* is read. Only one doubtful letter in the series is indicated even though it is impossible to obtain any meaning from that reading, a fact which should make the editor hesitate to accept it as certain. Similarly in 85. 7 we find *επιτεπερου*, which most probably should be *ἐπὶ τῷ πρός* (see below, No. 85). But in 67. i. 13, *κληθέντος* is read, when there can be no doubt about the reading of kappa. As a result, a dot or the lack of it has no significance, and one is somewhat inclined to doubt the correctness of any reading which seems the least out of the ordinary. Consequently, I feel that a thorough re-editing of many of the texts will be necessary before their real significance can be determined.

Accentuation of the names of months which are oxytones and are followed by a numeral causes continual trouble, the editor wavering between the grave and the acute accent. For the occurrence of the acute see 62. 18; 66. 16; 67. i. 6, 13 and 80. 41. The vocative form *ἄδελφε* appears as *ἀδελφαί* (102. 11) and *ἀδελφέ* (109. 20).

Lack of knowledge concerning the system of fractions and the way in which they were expressed made impossible the interpretation of 99. 2, ηιολό = $1/8 + 1/16 + 1/32$. Likewise it caused no misgivings in reading *ἔκκαιωδέκατον ὅκτωκαιδέκατον* in 74. 33–34, a combination which certainly would be most unusual if not impossible,¹ and on which the editor makes no comment.

In dealing with individual papyri in the following paragraphs, I wish to concern myself only with those points which I feel may be adequately handled on the basis of the text as it stands.

64. The “small and unskilled hand” in which this document was written has caused the editor to believe that it contains a “term hitherto unknown,” namely, *φυλακρισία*, for which no suitable meaning could be given. It is to be noted that to read *φυλακρισίαν*, line 7, *φυλακρισίαν*, lines 13–14, and *φυλακρισία*, line 24, sigma and one iota must be supplied by the editor in each case. Furthermore, iota is added at the end of line 13 and sigma at the beginning of line 14, although the preceding and following lines at these points have suffered no mutilation requiring the editorial addition of letters. Consequently, the papyrus presents in their entirety letters that have been read *φυλακρια*. Since there is no such form, the simplest solution of the problem is to suppose that *ε* on the papyrus has been read as *ρ* and that the word in question is *φυλακεία*, for *φυλακία*. For the use of the phrase *εἰς φυλακείαν*, to be read in lines 6–7, in the appointment of guards see P. Oxy., XIV, 1627, 12. Concerning the appointment of guards for the Sarapeum at Oxyrhynchus see P. Oxy., I, 43, verso ii. 7–13. The citation Wilcken, *Chrest.* No. 43, is incorrect. The reference is to P. Lips. Inv. 362, unpublished, given in part in the Introduction to *Chrest.* No. 43.

67. This is a fragment not of a petition but of judicial proceedings in con-

¹ Cf. Wileken, *Ostr.*, I, 774–79.

nexion with several cases in court. For similar documents compare especially P. Oxy., XVII, 2111, "Judicial Proceedings" (*ca. A.D. 135*), in which, as here, the different cases were marked off by a horizontal line drawn across the column, also P. Amh. 65 (Early II A.D.) and P. Amh. 66 (A.D. 124).

67. i. 13. Read Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντ]ονείνου.

67. ii. 7, and note, διεσπατάλησεν: The note states that "σπατάλη means 'waste' in modern Greek," but no cognizance is taken of the fact that the verb σπαταλᾶω, "to live luxuriously," occurs in the New Testament, James 5:5 and I Tim. 5:6. Sophocles *Lexicon* cites additional references to the word.

72. 24, μη(τρὸς) Σιν . . . τος: Read μη(τρὸς) Σινθῆτος (cf. Preisigke, *Namenbuch*).

72. 34, δοῦλ(ος?): Read δοῦλ(ος) (cf., e.g., P. Mich. 224. 996, 1016, 1021).

73. I quote lines 15–20, inasmuch as they seem to provide the solution of the abbreviation *ἀταλ* found here as well as in P. Oxy., I, 85. The reading of (δηναρίων) in line 16 is probably incorrect, since no numeral follows it and no denarii are included in the total.

15. δι]αφορᾶς ἐντοπίου λι(τραι) ἀταλ() η

. . . ε (δηναρίων) λι(τραι) ἀταλ() ε

συκίου λι(τραι) ἀταλ() ε

συκίου εχαλορον και

. π . . ρ . . . ων λι(τραι) ἀταλ() ξ

20. ζτρος β Αθύρ λ δι[αφο]ρὰ τάλ(αντα) λ.

It is to be noted that a total of thirty talents is given in line 20, likewise that by adding the numerals following *ἀταλ* in lines 15–17 and 19 a total of thirty is obtained. The logical conclusion is that *τάλ* of *ἀταλ* is to be resolved *τάλ(αντα)*. P. Oxy., I, 85, ii. 17 and iv. 17, notes, indicates that the abbreviation was written *ἀταλ'*, the *a* being directly linked with *τάλ*. Therefore I cannot agree with Segrè, who interprets P. Oxy., I, 85. ii. 16–18, χαλκοῦ τοῦ μὲν ἐλατοῦ λι(τραι) ἀταλ c (δηναρίων) 'Α, τοῦ δὲ χυτοῦ λι(τραι) ἀταλ() δ as χαλκοῦ τοῦ μὲν ἐλατοῦ λι(τραι) a τάλ(αντα) c (δηναρίων) 'Α, τοῦ δὲ χυτοῦ λι(τραι) a τάλ(αντα) δ,² and iv. 17, κριθῆς (ἀρτάβαι) ἀταλ() ιγ (δηναρίων) φ as κριθῆς (ἀρτάβης) a τάλ(αντα) ιγ (δηναρίων) φ.³ It also seems very improbable that in all these instances only one unit of each substance would be on hand at the end of the month. It is preferable, therefore, to take *a* with *τάλ* and resolve the whole as ἀ(ργυρίου) τάλ(αντα). This means that the number of units in each case was lacking. The omission seems less strange when we consider that the members of the guild give at their own assessment (*ιδίω τιμήματι*) the value (*τιμή*) of goods in stock and that the money value, not the quantity, is the important item in the declaration. That the latter is true is evidenced by the fact that in P. Harr. 73 care was taken to total the various sums.

² Angelo Segre, *Circolazione monetaria e prezzi nel mondo antico ed in particolare in Egitto*, p. 159.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 108–9.

Another similar document is P.S.I. 202, in which both quantity and value seemingly were given.

78. 6. ξοειδίων: Perhaps ξοειδίων for ξφδίων, "images." Lines 5-6 should be translated "(has paid) for [not in] frankincense for two images (?)."

79. 11. σφαιρι . . . α: Read σφαιριστήρια. Concerning ball courts in connection with baths see P. Oxy., XII, 1450. 5, 7.

82. 13. νότον: Translate "south," not "west."

85. 7-9. ἔχειν παρὰ σοῦ διὰ τῆς επιτεπερου 'Οξυρύγχων πόλει σοῦ Ἐρμαίου Διουνσίου καὶ μετόχων τραπέζης: Read ἔχειν παρὰ σοῦ διὰ τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ πρὸς 'Οξυρύγχων πόλει Σαραπείου Διουνσίου καὶ μετόχων τραπέζης (cf. P. Oxy., I, 91. 9; III, 513. 38; XII, 1473. 6).

88. 18. μάφορι: The nominative form of this word is not *μάφορις* as given in the note but *μαφόριον*, nor is its meaning uncertain. It is listed in Sophocles *Lexicon* and defined as "a kind of hood or veil." For the spelling *μάφοριν* for *μαφόριον* see Mayser, *Grammatik*, I, 260.

89. "Cheque to Banker." I feel that after revision this document will be found to be a receipt.

91. 4. ρξα: Read ρξα.

92. 5. μ(όνας): Read μ(όναι).

93. i. 15-17 and 19-24. These lines may be completed as follows from lines 5-12:

- 15. [ε' σάκ(κοι) ι', (ἀρτάβαι) κ.
[(ἀρτάβαι) κδ.
[σάκ(κοι) ι', (ἀρτάβαι) κ.
- 19. [ι', (ἀρτάβαι) κ.
[(ἀρτάβαι) κδ.
Παταᾶ[πις δηλ(ατῶν) ζ' φο(ρά), δνο(ι) ε', σάκ(κοι) ι', (ἀρτάβαι) κ.
[κδ.
[θ' φο(ρά), δνο(ι) ε', σάκ(κοι) ι', (ἀρτάβαι) κ.
[κδ.

97. 18. 'ζηρκα, sc. τάλαντα: The impossibility of such a figure is apparent. Since it represents a total sum, and the total that can be calculated from the amounts recorded in the document, seemingly incomplete, exceeds 6,700 talents, 'ζηρκα may be correct.

102. After a statement by the editor that *ω* and *ο* are identical in this private letter we are prevented through editorial correction from seeing just how they were used. However, in lines 2-3 the editor seems to have given inadvertently the original text, for he does not recognize at this point one of the common phrases used in letters. Instead of *πρῶτον ω..ν* (ll. 2-3) read *πρῶτον ὀλον* for *πρὸ τῶν δλων*. For the use of this phrase see F. X. J. Exler, *A Study in Greek Epistolography*, p. 108.

102. 5. πα . . . ν θεοῖς: Read πάσειν θεοῖς.

104. 1-5. ἐὰ]ν] εύρω τὴ[ν πα]ραθήκην [] . . . μη] ὑπολαβ[]αι ἀπάνθρωπον, καίρω μαθήσει πόσον ἔξωδιασα ἀργύριον ἔως προκόψω: I suggest ἐὰ]ν]

εῦρω τὴν παραθήκην [πέμψω ἀργύρῳ]ιογ μῆ] ὑπολάβ[ης με εἰν]αι ἀπάνθρωπον.
καίρῳ μαθήσει κτλ: Translate μαθήσει “you [not he] will learn.”

104. 5-7. καὶ ξητῷ καὶ Μαρίνου ἀπὸ μέρους ἐκπ[λ]ηξαι εἰ μὴ πεποιήκειν
ἔμαντρῷ σύνεργα καλὰ πάλαι: This is translated “I am going to give Marinus a
good scare for my part, too, if he hasn’t done his duty by me properly long
ago.” The editor prefers to take ἐκπλέξαι for ἐκπλῆξαι, i.e., “to scare” rather
than “to get out of difficulty” (transitive sense) on the grounds that the latter
meaning does not suit the context. The contrary seems to me to be the case.
The letter appears to have been written to a person who has asked for financial
assistance. The finances of the writer are not what he would like them to be
inasmuch as it has cost him considerable “to get ahead.” In the second place,
he is trying to help out (ἐκπλέξαι) Marinus to some extent (ἀπὸ μέρους) if
he has not already made for him some fine material.⁴ In other words, he is
going to pay Marinus, if not in full, something in advance on material not
completed because he needs money. I should, therefore, translate lines 1-7 as
follows: “If I find the deposit, I shall send you money that you may not think
that I am hard-hearted. In time you will learn how much I spent before
getting ahead. I am also seeking to help Marinus somewhat (even) if he has
not long since completed some fine materials for me.”

104. 8-11. ἀγνοεῖς πόσα κάμψω, σοὶ δὲ οὐκέτι μεμαίηκεν {σοὶ}. περὶ τοῦ
κερματίου ἔλα μὲν δυναθῆς ἀγοράσαι μοι κτλ: Remove period after {σοὶ} and
place after κερματίου (cf. P. Oxy., VIII, 1155. 5).

107. 5. θεῶ: A study of Plate 1 shows that τ was corrected to θ .

109. 5. ἴψηλόν: This is translated “a long robe.” The obvious use of the
word here is as an adjective modifying ὄνος, to be understood from line 2, and
meaning tall or big (cf. Preis. *Wörterbuch*, s.v. for meaning and citation, P.
Flor., 145. 2, ὄνος θηλείας ἴψηλάς).

109. 7-10. Translate “Consider my brother Antas, not me ($\alpha\nu\theta'$ ήμῶν), under
obligation to you when he asks for expenses,” not “See that brother Antas
conveys my thanks to you, if he wants his expenses.”

109. 15-17. ἐγράψαμεν δὲ τῇ Ἀντινόῳ οἱ π.. εἰδότες ὅποι δεῖσει ήμᾶς ἐκδημεῖν,
γράψασθε: This is translated, “We have written to the wife of Antinous. When
we know the place to which we shall have to move, I will write you.” “To the
wife of Antinous” does not translate τῇ Ἀντινόῳ. Whether the papyrus had
τῇ Ἀντινόῳ (= ‘Αντινόου) οἱ or τῇ Ἀντινόῳ οἱ it is impossible to determine.
The latter seems to have been the case, since the negative οὐ is not translated.
I suggest προειδότες for π.. εἰδότες and a period after ἐκδημεῖν. I should then
translate, “We wrote to the wife of Antinous knowing beforehand where we
should have to go. I shall write to you.”

110. 12.]ν Διονύ[σι]ον: Read τὸ]ν Διονύ[σι]ον.

112. 4. ν . . . : Read νυνι.

Under the heading “Summaries of Documents and Letters” there is a

⁴ Preisigke defines σύνεργον as “Handarbeit (= durch Handarbeit hergestellter Gegenstand, in der Regel gewebter Stoff zum Gewande).”

number of papyri whose size indicates that much more than is immediately apparent is to be gained from a close study of them. It is to be regretted that Nos. 164 and 165 containing slightly more than twelve columns of two tax rolls of the first to second century were thought of very little importance, the editor quoting only a few lines of each.

VERNE B. SCHUMAN

Indiana University

An Outline of the History of the Greek Language, with Particular Emphasis on the Koine and the Subsequent Periods. By PROCOPE S. COSTAS. (The Eurasian Library of America, *Origines Eurasiatiae*; II: "Series historico-philologica," Vol. VI.) Chicago: Ukrainian Academy of Sciences of America, 1936. Pp. 144.

Scholars interested in the history of the Greek language have for the most part limited their attention to the early, classical, and Hellenistic periods, closing with the Greek of the New Testament. Dr. Costas, in this, his doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago, has attempted to give a connected history of Greek down to the present day, treating but briefly the earlier portion because of the manuals of Meillet and Atkinson, and devoting himself essentially to the evolution of the Koine from its beginning to the present day. After an extended Bibliography, he has chapters on "The Early and Classical Periods" (pp. 27-40), "The Koine" (pp. 41-57), "Characteristics of the Koine" (pp. 58-71), "Atticism" (pp. 72-74), "Formation of the Modern Vernacular" (pp. 75-96), "Characteristics of the Modern Vernacular" (pp. 97-123), "The Modern Dialects" (pp. 124-29), and "The Language Question" (130-37).

The great difficulty, through several centuries, is to get reliable evidence as to what is truly popular language and what is in reality learned or semilearned speech. Dr. Costas has assembled the conclusions that have been drawn and gives us perhaps the most faithful picture that can be presented at the present time. A great merit of his work is the extensive bibliography in the footnotes, along with the opinions, confirmatory or divergent, which are expressed in the various works.

No Greek could write such a history without taking a stand on the mooted question of vernacular (*demotike*) and literary (*katharevousa*) speech. After referring to the problem several times (pp. 30-33, 73-74), he takes the stand (p. 135) that the *katharevousa* might be made the standard new speech if it would rid itself of certain unnecessary remnants from the older literary languages (third declensional forms, reduplication in perfect passive participles, verbal augment when irregular) and would cease to use words in ancient meanings, which now have well-established other meanings.

To take up some specific points, I note that Ur-Griechen is used 28.20 for Pre-Greeks, a meaning which it could have only geographically, not linguisti-

cally. The author consistently speaks of double consonants when he means long consonants, that is, consonants long in pronunciation and doubled in writing, and of single consonants (instead of short) when they are written single (61.2-3; 94.1-2; 98.2-4; 125.12); these terms cannot be justified as applied to the pronunciation. At 98.2 *ην* seems to be out of place, or to be misprinted for something else. At 99.3 the modern ἀλέτρι for the ancient ἄροτρον is not an example of the phonetic change just formulated. Further, many words are presented in orthographies which are not familiar to me, perhaps because of the confusing etacism: thus 101.16 *καλύτερος μεγαλύτερος* for *καλλίτερος μεγαλύτερος*, and 105.1 *εἰμπορῶ* for *ἡμπορῶ* or *ἐμπορῶ* (in actual speech *μπορῶ*). The term "flexible verbs" at 102.16 is unknown to me.

The presentation is somewhat handicapped by awkwardness in the use of hyphens and parentheses (e.g., 100.16; 104.7; 105.9), and by too many misprints, not all of which are gathered in the Errata at the end of the book; in fact, the errata themselves contain three errors.

But these flaws cannot materially interfere with the value of the volume, which contains in convenient form a great mass of information not readily accessible elsewhere, along with detailed bibliography.

ROLAND G. KENT

University of Pennsylvania

Lateinische Umgangssprache. 2d rev. ed. By J. B. HOFMANN. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1936. Pp. xiv+214. Rm. 4.50 (bound 6.00).

Just ten years after the first edition comes a second enlarged edition of the manual of Latin conversational or colloquial usage by the reviser of Walde who is also an editor of the Thesaurus. The price of the complete work has been reduced. It does not appear that the first edition was exhausted; so far as I can see the second is simply the first with a new title-page, three changes on pages xiv f., and twenty-five pages (185 ff.) of additions and corrections (plus a special index of five pages more). These last presumably have been gathered during the last ten years and may be had separately at the price of Rm. 1.00.

They include, besides additional references to articles and books, mostly of later date than 1926, a large number of additional illustrations, all of which are apposite, many drawn from modern languages; and some I find of peculiar interest. On page 195 Hofmann has *blennus* from *βλεννός*, i.e., "poor fish" (Athenaeus 7. 288a, Kaibel, *Com. Gr. Frag.*, p. 162, 43), a word to which I return, *stulti (uel blenni) gratia*, in an article ("Tusca origo Raetis") published in *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.*, Vol. XLVIII (1937).

Hofmann gives a reference to his own and Slotty's discussion (in *Indogerm.*

Forsch.) of the term *Umgangssprache*, but not to Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique* (1935), pages 168 ff. It still remains, however, to distinguish more clearly, in conversational language, more than one stratum of locutions, since speech habits are never permanently fixed. Side by side with the historic (for we learn to talk from our elders), are at least the current, the authoritarian (that which is sanctioned by written usage), and the neologistic. In written records, say Plautus or Petronius, these may all be found cheek by jowl and need to be disentangled. Even your grand stylist at times has something to reveal. Cicero, in his letters, is a favorite quarry (Hofmann might have quoted the familiar *Philotimus nullus uenit* "Ph. never came—not a bit of it," lit. "not a bit of him," Roby § 1069); but the idiom of Latin verse should not be overlooked. Epic, even in Vergil, is in certain ways intermediate in character between conversational Latin and the formal *prosa oratio*. Words and phrases are shorter; simple rather than compound verbs are favored; sentences are simpler and shorter than in prose, and in its constructions (e.g., in the use of the infinitive instead of the gerund or *ut* with the subjunctive) the language of verse is often in close agreement with that of daily life. It has recently been pointed out in a Harvard dissertation by C. J. Armstrong (see *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.*, XLVII [1936], 209 ff.) that certain types of compound adjectives, particularly those in *-ger* and *-fer*, of which epic was more than usually fond, actually have something of a popular flavor about them. Hofmann might easily have added a chapter on this subject (*furcifer*, *barbiger*, etc., are touched only incidentally).

The observation that the genuine historic present "sich . . . vor allem dort findet, wo eine Pronominalform (lat. *ibi* wie d. *da*) oder eine kräftig anknüpfende Konjunktion (*atque*) die unmittelbare Anschauung noch stützt. Vgl. z.B. Plaut. Epid. 245 *ibi illa nominat Strattipolem*, . . . Mil. 287 f. *forte fortuna . . . despexi . . . atque ego illi aspicio*" may be commended to someone in search of a subject for a dissertation. For it ends: "Wie sich der spätere volkstümliche Gebrauch . . . dazu verhält, ist noch ununtersucht."

Wackernagel's comparison of Greek *τόπερ* "gerade dann" with Lat. *topper*, cited with approval by Hofmann, is an advance over anything in the etymological dictionaries. But I miss *futilis*, a racy, conversational word, if any ever was; and I doubt whether Hofmann's account of *ad Vestae* and the like is historically sound (Brugmann, *Grundriss* [2d ed.], ii. 2. 2, p. 610). Editors of Aristophanes tempted to question *ξενγάριον βοοῖν* (cf. *ξενγός ἐμβάδων*, or *ξενγός ἐμβάδου* Meinecke) may be interested in the modern German phrase, "unnatural" (Neil) as it seems on the surface, "ein Paar Schuhe gedoppelt" (*höhersprachlich*, Hofmann), from which the notion of dual (*gedoppelt*; *besohlt*, *gemeinsprachlich*) has completely faded. The relative weight given to the (merely grammatical) categories of case and number, respectively, may easily give rise to conflict in the I. Eu. system of inflection, as was shrewdly observed many years ago by Exon in an article on the causation of analogy which deserves to be far better known than it is.

Hofmann has added at the end several excellent specimens of continuous text that make very clear some of the differences between different Latin styles. Brevity, however, is at best a deceptive test; one can readily imagine a member of Congress, or of parliament for that, trying to say "two and two make four."

J. WHATMOUGH

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax. By EINAR LÖFSTEDT. ("Skrifter utgivna av kungl. humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund," Vol. XXIII.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1936. Pp. xiii+232.

It may well be good advice to budding Latinists to learn Swedish. Happily the extreme (and extremely childish) linguistic nationalism that besets most of modern Europe and bids fair to lead to desperate results, if the folly of linguistic isolation is not realized in time to lead to a reaction, has not yet spread to Scandinavia. Löfstedt, with his usual sanity, continues to write for us in simple German, and those of us who have been too lazy or too short-sighted in reading the signs of the times to learn Swedish should be grateful; for the Scandinavians are rapidly passing, if they have not already passed, their Continental rivals in Latin scholarship, and may not be content much longer to present their work in a foreign tongue.

Löfstedt's work is always refreshing. He will have none of the threshing of the old straw of the handful of school and college authors that clutters the floors of classical seminaries—it takes a rare talent to garner a few grains there for planting nowadays—but ranges over the later literature, down to medieval times, and his knowledge of it is truly enviable.

His latest is essentially a new work, though the Preface modestly describes it as replacing the *Spätklassische Studien* of his youth; it does that, and it supplements his *Syntactica*, and does more besides. In greater wealth of illustration and discussion, and in fuller maturity of judgment, it marks, of course (if I may say so without impertinence), an advance beyond its fore-runner of thirty years ago, fine as the qualities of that were, and fulfills all its promise. The threads which run through all Löfstedt's examinations of Latin usage are once more conspicuous—the defense of the *Überlieferung* against self-styled emendators, the striking illustrations from Romance and other languages, the skilful use of the theory of *Gedankenkontamination* to untie the knot of some apparently irregular or illogical but nevertheless persistent usage (e.g., pp. 8, 16, 32, 142), the restrained appeal to Greek influence (e.g., pp. 5 n., 32, 197 f.) in contrast with the telling citation of the Greek text, whether translation or original, to put the interpretation of the Latin beyond doubt (e.g., p. 38).

The first part of the book contains eight chapters on Latin particles: (1) *neque* instead of *neque . . . neque*; (2) *ut* and *ubi* in the function of the relative pronoun, e.g., Pers. *Sat.* v. 73; (3) *quod* and *quoniam* in expressions of compari-

son; (4) *quam = ut, sicut*, or (resuming *tantus*) equivalent to *quantus*; (5) *nisi* adversative (= *sed*) after a negative (so in English, especially in dialect usage, a development of meaning in the opposite direction, "nobbut" i.e., "nought but" = "except, unless"); (6) *-que* otiose. But the weakening of *-que* is, if I mistake not, old (cf. Lucr. v. 975, 985, 1237, where it is disjunctive), and in fact, as Löfstedt points out (p. 42), *quisue* too is at times no more than *quis* (Sidon. iv. 11. 3) (cf. *huiusque* = *huiuscemus*); and to Löfstedt's *ideoque* = *ideo*, *itaque* = *ita add* (*h*)*ac sic ergo* = *sic ergo*, frequent in the *Peregrinatio Egeriae*. More interesting is *quique* instead of *qui* or of *isque*, exactly like the careless English *and who, and which*, without any preceding relative clause; or the epigraphic *plerus* for *plerusque* (note especially *et pleros* = *et plerosque*, *utrorum* = *utrorumque*); (7) adverbs, e.g., *statim*, becoming conjunctions (cf. English *after* = *after that, now* = *now that*), though I think that some of Löfstedt's examples, as he himself admits (p. 48), would be better explained as merely hypotactic; and his *propterea non posse* (*διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι*) is not quite the same thing either; (8) pleonasm in the use of particles and adverbs—here again tautology such as *nequiquam frustra* (Apuleius) is in fact much older: *temere incassum frustaque*, Lucr. ii. 1060.

Part II contains thirty-two items, partly matters of syntax and style, partly matters of semasiology. They are too numerous to set out one by one, but I may mention a few by way of showing their nature and content: *loqui* (*dicere de aliquo*) pejorative like Eng. "comment" (sc. adversely), cf. *animaduertere* "punish"; *secretum* as a noun so that Löfstedt at last makes sense of Petr. frag. 39.3 *secretaque longa* without resort to emendation (for *longa*, editors have proposed *sponda*, *lampas*, *lodes*, and even *lingual*!). The trouble here, of course, was two adjectives together, of which one had become a noun (cf. Livy's well-known *pessimo publico*, ii. 1. 1); verbal adjectives in *-bilis* active or quasi-instrumental in force (here Löfstedt had Svennung's *Untersuchungen zu Palladius* before him); the ellipse of *fieri*, *euenire*, rather like the lack (not the ellipse) of the copula; the very interesting list of words confused in popular, almost popular-etymological, usage, e.g., *mendosus*, *mendax*, *mendacious*, *mentio* "falsehood" (: *mentiri*), *diuinitas*, "soothsaying" (: *diuinare*), whence, I suppose, the new *dealitas* (e.g., Lucifer), (*h*)*erilis hereditarius*, *detestatio* "castration," and the inscriptions, I think, would augment even Löfstedt's long list of such shifts of meaning; *refert* for *differt* (at least as old as Horace *Serm.* ii. 3. 157); *una* as a preposition (this also is epigraphic), and (p. 114, n. 2) *in se* = *una* (cf. Diehl's index). Some of Löfstedt's examples of verbs with two accusatives, however, seem to me better explained as due to the very common pregnant meaning in transitive verbs, e.g., *eum potauerunt acetum* in Commodian *carm. apol.* 418 is "gave him, caused him to drink, vinegar."

Last of all, there is an excellent chapter on the mutual influence of Greek and Latin in syntax at a date when the Mediterranean was virtually bilingual. Löfstedt is too well informed to make sweeping statements and knows that each case of the kind has to be dealt with on its own merits.

Two small points: (1) I notice that there is no use made of Silverstein's work on the *Visio Pauli* (1935), in which readings very different from those of the edition by M. R. James are reported (e.g., for cap. 16, discussed by Löfstedt on p. 11). And (2) the evidence for *Caralitanus*, not Löfstedt's *Calari-tanus* (p. 227), seems to be overwhelming (see, e.g., *Thes. ling. Lat., Onom.* iii. 179. 59-70).

J. WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Panhellenism in Aristophanes. By WILLIAM MEREDITH HUGILL. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. Pp. viii+106. \$1.50.

This interesting and well-written book is chiefly a study of the *Lysistrata*, although other plays are also drawn upon to illustrate the poet's Panhellenism. Perhaps we should say "politician" rather than "poet," for Hugill is convinced that Aristophanes was essentially a politician. The motives of Aristophanes, however, were patriotic and not partisan. He was not opposed to democratic government but simply to its predatory policy. Similarly, his anti-imperialism is merely the negative side of Panhellenism and must not be interpreted as favoring oligarchic institutions. In 411 B.C., therefore, Aristophanes seized upon the general war-weariness of the people to advocate not a humiliating peace as some of the intriguing oligarchs might have wished but a "peace with honor." Through her financial exactions from the allies and by her imperialistic decrees, Athens had lost her old-time popularity. The ruin of Athens, however, would lead to the ruin of Greece, and therefore peace was to be equally desired by all states. A realistic attitude dictated that the leadership of the new Greece should be divided between Athens and Sparta. This, then, is the general Panhellenic bearing of the *Lysistrata*.

In the second part of his study Hugill analyzes the famous simile of the carded fleece and civic web, *Lys.* 572-86. Lysistrata's allegory may be applied both to local and to imperial politics. Its purpose is to produce a cloak of common good will. In the domestic field the evils of democracy and oligarchy are attacked; sycophants and clubs must go. And the loyalty and unity of the city population should be rewarded by placing the metics on a perfect equality with the full citizens. In applying the allegory to the empire, Aristophanes advocates a scheme of imperial federation, a reformed confederacy. The new prosperity, which is sure to result, is held out to the Demos, but not to the imperialistic democracy. Hegemony, not empire, must be the cry, and it involved a corollary. In his earlier plays Aristophanes had made it clear that the old assessment of Aristeides was a fair remuneration to Athens for the naval protection she gave the allies. This cloak for the people, therefore, represents the kind of prosperity Cimon had brought in the good old days. Wealth will come with the inevitable expansion of trade; the fleet can keep the seas clear; perhaps Persia can be plundered. Obviously, great advantages

will accrue to the members of the League as well as to Athens—but the efficiency of the fleet must be maintained, and this depended on the tribute. All this was contingent, however, on the conclusion of peace.

Hugill has stated the case about as well as it can be, but it leaves one with a slight feeling of unreality. Does Aristophanes really say all this? Were the allies so contented under Cimon, and just how practical was the new plan for peace? Probably there will never be general agreement as to how far Lysistrata echoes the sentiments of Aristophanes, but it will be helpful to remember that Aristophanes was, after all, a comic poet.

C. A. ROBINSON, JR.

Brown University

Eine Handelsrede aus der Zeit des Demosthenes: Die Rede XXXIV gegen Phormion. By ERICH ZIEBARTH. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1936. Pp. xi+34.

This booklet is intended for the use of students in the German classical Gymnasium, with the following purpose: "die Rede gegen Phormion als Musterbeispiel für die Gruppe der Handelsreden einzuführen und durch ihre Erklärung ein anschauliches Bild von einem attischen Handelsprozess zu geben." This purpose is laudable, and the editor is singularly equipped for his task, as all readers will admit who have studied his *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Seeraubs und Seehandels im alten Griechenland*, published in 1929.

Ziebarth apparently accepts the text history as outlined in the *praefatio* of the Oxford edition (1920) by Rennie, for he refers the reader to it without comment. His critical apparatus is adequate.

In the main, the notes are helpful and accurate, but a few objections may be set down as follows: § 5—*Lampis war also Sklave*. Nothing is farther from the truth, in spite of the apparent corroboration of this statement contained in § 10, for § 46 shows that he was competent to testify and § 37 implies that he had been set free. Here Ziebarth has relied too confidently on U. E. Paoli, *L'Autonomia del diritto commerciale-marittimo nella Grecia class.* (Napoli, 1934). In connection with § 21 the author discusses the distribution of the parts of the speech between Chrysippus and his brother without adding anything new; it seems a pity that there is no mention of that excellent study by the late J. O. Lofberg ("The Speakers in the Case of Chrysippus versus Phormio," *Class. Phil.*, XXVI [1932], 329–35). In § 42 the editor would retain the words following *ἐπιτόπιον* to the end of the sentence, but he does not state whether he regards them as a part of the law or not. Certainly these words are not a part of the law, but they belong in the text and are genuine words of the speaker, serving as a transition to the following argument.

Unlike most German scholars, Ziebarth gives due credit to American specialists in this field, such as George M. Calhoun, Gertrude Smith, and R. J. Bonner. It is especially gratifying to me to observe various references to

Aspects of Athenian Democracy by the last named, since it is a recent publication on the Sather foundation at the University of California. Ziebarth's references attest the rapid and wide spread of the lectures published in this fine series. Through inadvertence or otherwise, there is no mention of *Three Private Speeches of Demosthenes*, by F. C. Doherty (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), which contains the oration *Against Phormio*. This seems a bit strange in view of the author's expressed regret that so few annotated editions of the shorter private speeches of Demosthenes have appeared. But Ziebarth would not have gained much, if anything, by consulting Doherty's book.

An *Anhang* contains Demos. xxxv. 10-13 and is equipped with notes. This passage throws additional light on the oration *Against Phormio*.

This booklet is dedicated to the memory of Johannes Geffcken, the general editor of the series to which it belongs.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

Essays on Ancient Fiction. By ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1936. Pp. ix+207. \$2.50.

Professor Haight is already well known as the author of a number of readable books which interpret ancient life and literature to the modern world. The present volume, *Essays in Ancient Fiction*, has points of contact with her previous publications on Horace and Apuleius, and at the same time introduces the reader to new fields. The five essays, though grouped around a central theme, are really, as both the title and the Preface indicate, separate studies, and are therefore provided with separate bibliographies at the close of the volume. The first, "Stories in Classical Prose," surveys the tales which can be regarded as related to the novels of Apuleius and Petronius, particularly the stories included in the histories of Herodotus and Livy and the special types of tale that grew up at Sybaris and Miletus. The second, under the title "Little Stories in Latin Elegiac Inscriptions," takes up material from the graffiti of Pompeii and the epitaphs published in Buecheler's *Carmina Latina epigraphica*. The inscriptions are grouped according to subject matter, with interpretive comment, and the Latin text is accompanied by verse translations, which as a rule follow quite closely the form of the Latin. The third essay, "Satire and the Latin Novel," opens with an excellent characterization of the Cynic philosopher, and then traces the presentation of Cynic doctrine through the Menipporean satire of Varro to the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca and the *Satyricon* of Petronius, with comments on the banquet as a literary motif and on the differences between the *Satyricon* and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. The fourth study, "Prose Fiction in the Augustan Age," develops the interesting hypothesis that the students in the rhetorical schools were really working with the raw materials of fiction, and sketches a number of case outlines from Seneca's *Controversiae* which deal with romantic situations. The closing essay of the volume is an appreciative discussion of "Apuleius' Art of Story-

telling," with a detailed analysis of the stories in the *Metamorphoses*, the devices by which they are woven together, and the skill with which they are set off against one another. Miss Haight quite properly stresses the spiritual element in the *Metamorphoses* and shows how the religious experience of the eleventh book and the symbolism of the Cupid and Psyche story make the novel of Apuleius a very different thing from the *Λούκιος ἡ ὄντος* that has come down to us in Greek.

Readers of the volume will put it down with a sense of gratitude to the author for having led them through such pleasant and unfrequented bypaths. They will perhaps wish, particularly in the first two essays, that Professor Haight had given a little more in the way of generalization and drawing-together of threads. Other possible criticisms and suggestions are all concerned with minor points. Probably one should not quarrel over matters of vocabulary, but it seems a bit unfortunate that the term *novella*, which has such a definite technical sense, should be applied to the stories of the *Panchatantra* and of Herodotus and Livy, and that the word "rape," which we associate with scenes of violence, should be introduced into situations which are at least partly romantic. On page 43, a comma after "Plutarch" would make the sentence easier to follow. In the verse translations of the inscriptions, we should of course not demand literal accuracy, but one is inclined to question the proper noun "Dolly" as the equivalent of *pupa* (p. 53) and the rendering of *quisquis amare velat* as "one who has impeded the game" (p. 55). One wonders, too, whether it is quite accurate to include under the "erotic" inscriptions a couplet commemorating the meeting of *duo . . . sodales . . . Caius et Aulus* (p. 52) and whether there should not be a hint that the "Augustus" who freed Titus Aelius Stephanus was probably, as the gentile name would indicate, the emperor Hadrian (p. 65). Is it necessarily true that "in the case of great persons, the metrical epitaphs must have been written by members of these highly educated families" (p. 61)? And should not such inscriptions be called "funerary" rather than "funereal" (pp. 58 ff.)? It is apparently a slip that the four-line inscription beginning *Nihil durare potest* (pp. 51-52) is described as "composed of five pentameters." If the reader did not have the dates of the authors in mind, he might be misled by a sentence on page 91 which seems to place Lucilius after Varro. And on page 101 it is not clear how the phrase "à la the criminal" applies to Aeacus.

CORNELIA C. COULTER

Mount Holyoke College

Petronio. By ENZO V. MARMORALE. Napoli: R. Ricciardi Editore, 1936. Pp. 115.

In this fine essay, distinguished alike by soundness of judgment and felicity of style, the author emphasizes an important aspect of Petronius and his work which, amid the many problems of interpretation suggested by the *Satyricon*, has often been overlooked or too little appreciated, namely, the profound

pessimism of the author's outlook and the moral as well as the intellectual elevation and isolation from which it springs.

Petronius, Marmorale assures us, is no pornographer at heart but an artist who stands above and apart from the things he narrates, one who derives his spiritual satisfaction not from the subjective contemplation of lascivious incidents, nor yet from the mere delight in comedy, although that may be considerable, but rather from the objective, ironical, keenly observant, and gracefully executed portrayal of society as he saw it. For him, as for Tacitus, the picture was gloomy—nay, tragic; but, unlike Tacitus, Petronius realizes the futility of protest. He sees no prospect of a better society and hence makes no attempt to correct; instead he only smiles, sadly on the whole, when he contemplates society or humanity in general, but at times also bitterly (cf. the will of Eumolpus, the shipwreck scene, and the whole drama at Croton). Although he saw the same world that Juvenal saw, it was not his nature to shout and curse, nor would it have been at all safe, much less fashionable, for him to do so, even in a guarded manner. Returning from Bithynia, he found himself in the midst of the corrupt court circle of Nero, where honest *industria* could have little hope of reward. He had either to succumb morally or to adapt himself externally and in ironical mood to conditions as they were; he chose the latter course, as Tacitus suggests: *revolutus ad vitia seu vitiorum imitatione*. Indeed, under the circumstances, Petronius, as a man of superior taste and discernment and one who did not care to become a martyr to a lost cause, could hardly do better than to amuse himself as well as he could, to refuse to take life seriously, and, in so far as it was necessary to please or flatter the emperor in order to live, to do this as gracefully and nonchalantly as possible. He did not by nature or sympathy belong to the world of rascals and profligates with which he was surrounded, and the types of which he has described in the *Satyricon* as if there were at the time no other kind of people in the world.

But the *Satyricon* is first and foremost a work of art. The author wanted to write an entertaining novel in which the complete degradation of contemporary life (as it seemed to him) would be so vividly and so naturally depicted as to condemn itself, but with purity of intention, in a candidly simple style, and with a good dose of compassion for the miseries and natural weaknesses of human kind, even though these be manifested in the persons of the most dissolute or most despised characters. Petronius is no heartless wit, but a man of feeling, though he presents everything with the detachment of a Thucydides. Writing in this spirit, he did not need, nor did he offer to the Catos of his day or ours, any apology for his *novae simplicitatis opus*—*Quodque facit populus candida lingua refert*. He presents a world in dissolution and he diagnoses it with the patience and imperturbability of a physician—a physician who knows well enough what health is, and desires it, but who also knows, to his sorrow, that the disease before him is incurable, and therefore does not vainly prescribe for the patient. With his negative attitude, his despair of a society

that in reality could not be rebuilt without first being destroyed, Petronius may be considered one of those authors who prepared the advent of Christianity; that is, he helped break down such faith as remained in the old order. The following century was busy in the quest for a radical cure and finally found it in Christianity, though at a great cost.

Of course, the pessimism of Petronius does not lie on the surface of things. Ostensibly, everything in the *Satyricon* is a joke; and no doubt for Nero and his kind the romance was, and was meant to be, just that and nothing more. But the thoughtful reader who considers the character of the author as described by Tacitus, and who reads between the lines, will understand how deep this pessimism is, especially when he notes how much damning information the persons of the story are made to reveal by word and by action concerning society in general, and with what deliberate and consummate irony Petronius—at times almost in the manner of Swift in the *Modest Proposal* (cf. chap. 141)—represents the crudest excesses and the most unprincipled or unnatural conduct as something perfectly normal and reasonable. Many ideas expressed by characters in the *Satyricon* (especially by Encolpius and Eumolpus) would seem to be those of Petronius himself, but the ridiculous situations in which they are set forth make us understand that the author is holding himself nominally aloof. On the other hand, Marmorale believes that the discussion of eloquence at the beginning of our *Satyricon* merely pictures the decay of that art, and that it contains no positive recommendations to which Petronius himself would subscribe; Petronius realized that the fine ideal of the orator's education as outlined in chapter v belonged only in the past, and that such an orator would be no more welcome and useful in the Rome of that day than Eumolpus with his poetry was in the picture gallery or in the midst of the shipwreck.

I have tried to present Marmorale's view of Petronius as faithfully as possible, though not without some elaborations of my own in the same vein. His essay is to be warmly commended to all students of Petronius.

B. E. PERRY

University of Illinois

ΠΛΟΤΤΑΡΧΟΤ ΤΩΝ ΕΠΤΑ ΣΟΦΩΝ ΣΤΜΠΟΣΙΟΝ. Κείμενον. μετάφρασις καὶ ἐμηνεία ὑπὸ ΕΜΜΑΝΟΘΑ ΔΑΤΙΔ; Ἀθῆναι: Κόλλαρος, 1936.

This is a very curious book but, in spite of its many shortcomings, one not to be despised. Mr. David leans heavily on Mr. Sykutris for (probably) most matters of bibliography and text criticism, and on the new Teubner edition for his apparatus. But when he ventures, as he does not infrequently,¹ to de-

¹ Among many instances, he accepts Reiske's corrections at 149 C and E and Wyttenbach's at 157 B. If 149 C, παραλαβόντας, were not right, we should have (*τὸν*) Θαλῆν, *pace* Wilamowitz. See also Bernardakis, IV, xx-xxi.

part from the Paton-Pohlenz text, he is almost always right. On the other hand, he copies its symbols, arrangement, and even Latin phraseology so slavishly that he is lost when he is forced to abandon them.² He claims to have made use of all modern Greek work on the text,³ and he has diligently examined the somewhat obscure articles of Bases, Papabasileios, and Michaël⁴ in 'Αθηνᾶ, yet he has never heard of the most worthy contribution to the study of Plutarch ever made in this periodical, that by Hatzidakis in Volume XIII.⁵ He parades an impressive bibliography, but he is ignorant of the attempt of Sinko⁶ to link the *Convivium* with Plutarch's Pythagorizing dialogues and, of course, Hubert's⁷ important criticism. He quotes from Wilamowitz' famous article in *Hermes*, Volume XXV, but he has not read it with any care.⁸ It would, in fact, be safe to infer that Mr. David knows very little modern work on Plutarch not mentioned in Christ-Schmid⁹, or in Apelt.

In my opinion the chief service of this book is to print in full the corrections of Coraës, supplied to the editor by Mr. Sykutris. These are of the greatest value and, as might have been expected, often anticipate the worthier efforts of, among others, Pflugk, Wilamowitz, and Hauck.¹⁰ Of the five emendations proposed by the editor himself, two¹¹ are attractive, and none bad. The apparatus, which is the fullest and most serviceable yet produced, might have included a good deal more learned lumber:¹² such as 148 A: φιλίαν γε Wilam.;

² See, e.g., the app. at p. 41. 21 and 65. 17 ("locum inter se mutare malit Sykutris"). At p. 19. 11 *cum* is at best misleading.

³ Τὰς διωρθώσεις τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀνέφορα δλας (Introd., p. 31 n.).

⁴ As well as a good many unpublished notes of Mr. Sykutris, some very attractive.

⁵ Nor has he heard of Babbitt's Loeb Classical Library edition. Among the many things he might have learned from Hatzidakis (and Babbitt) are: the accent of ὀνώρδας (147 D) and ζωρία (154 B), though he has good company in this persistent error, since the editors of Aristophanes and even the new Liddell and Scott cling to the ζώνων inherited from Stephanus, even though Reiske corrected AP v. 157; that πρῶτος (152 A) is right; and the corrections ναὸν (156 B), δποι (162 A), though this is already Hercher's (*Hermes*, XI, 231), and πειστήον (164 C), the last of which is certainly right.

⁶ Eos xv. 113 ff.

⁷ Woch. f. kl. Phil. (1911), cols. 37-9.

⁸ To judge by Bernardakis' errors still left uncorrected; e.g., 158 A Reiske's, or Xylander's, ἄντι is still attributed to Wytt.; 162 C Xylander's εἰποι to Reiske; 151 A the defense of ηὐῶν (p. 214) is ignored. Now that Reiske's (ἢ) θυσία (146 D) is found in the favorite P, it is time that it should be in all texts. (And see Wilamowitz, p. 208, n. 1, for an excellent list of Reiske's conjectures confirmed by MSS. But not even Wilamowitz' authority can persuade editors to render to other scholars, and especially to Reiske, the credit due for emendations subsequently confirmed by new MSS).

⁹ Also the emendation which we now see to be a Reiske-Coraës-Haupt-Hauck farago, proposed again by Mr. Harrison in *Class. Rev.*, XLIV, 85.

¹⁰ 161 F and 163 C; the latter, however, was anticipated by Babbitt.

¹¹ Apart from the conjectures of Hatzidakis and Babbitt, which it should have mentioned. Most of Michaël, Apelt, and Castiglione might have been spared, though it is no doubt convenient to have it here rather than penciled in overpunctuated margins.

152 C: $\tau\hat{\eta}\varsigma \delta\hat{e} \sigma\langle\alpha\nu\tau\rangle\hat{o}\hat{n} \phi\omega\nu\hat{\eta}\varsigma$ Herwerden (*Plutarchea et Lucianea* [Utrecht, 1877], p. 7); 158 E: $\tau\hat{\eta}\nu \mu\hat{e}\nu \gamma\hat{a}\rho$ *ibid.* I think myself that at 158 D we should write *kai* $\langle\epsilon\hat{l}s\rangle^{12} \tau\hat{o} \mu\hat{e}\delta\hat{e}\nu \hat{\iota}\hat{a}\sigma\iota$.

The notes and Introduction appear to contain nothing both new and of value. I am not competent to estimate the merit of the translation into modern Greek. Misprints are not infrequent and occasionally annoying.¹³

It would be tempting, as Mr. Fraenkel once suggested in another matter, to placard the entrance to Plutarchean studies: "Kindern ohne Begleitung Erwachsener ist der Zutritt verboten." But this book need not be dismissed on that account, for an adult of some stature has gone along at least part of the way. But not far enough.

W. C. HELMBOLD

Trinity College, Hartford

Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I. von Aegypten: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion. By ERNST KORNEMANN. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1935. Pp. iv+267. Rm. 7.50.

This restoration of Ptolemy's history of Alexander is based, of course, on Arrian. Beginning with the fragments more or less directly ascribed to Ptolemy by Arrian, Professor Kornemann attempts to identify through style and content all of what he would call "Ptolemy in Arrian." From this material he then gives an extended characterization of the Egyptian king's work.

Such faults as this book may possess are those of its genre: any reconstructionist tends, perhaps rightly, to press his evidence too hard. Just as on a dark road a timid boy sees ghosts behind every tree and bush, so in Arrian Professor Kornemann is inclined to see Ptolemy behind every $\lambda\acute{e}\gamma\acute{e}\tau\acute{a}$ and $\tau\acute{\eta} \dot{\nu}\sigma\tau\acute{e}\rho\acute{a}\tau\acute{a}$. Although research in this field has uncovered many interesting points about the style and matter of the various historians, our author probably realizes as well as anyone else that these criteria are not proofs but indications. Nevertheless, he is prone to say, "This is Ptolemy," where "This may be Ptolemy" would be a more exact statement of the evidence.

In many cases his presentation of the evidence carries conviction. For example, his reasons for claiming for Ptolemy the speech of Alexander at Opis appear quite cogent. At the other extreme, the contention that such commonplace remarks as those about flatterers surrounding a king reflect an author who is a wise old king himself is not convincing. Finally, what Professor Kornemann considers his most important discovery—that the estimate of Alexander (Arrian *Ana.* vii. 28–30) is, in the main, Ptolemy's—is not so conclusive as the author would have us believe.

¹² Or *κείσ*, comparing Soph. frag. 871 Pearson (787 Nauck). Plutarch was fond of these verses, and they may have been floating about in his mind when he wrote this flowery passage.

¹³ As in the app. at p. 19. 10; 25. 10, 23; and n. 1, p. 36 ('Απάροι 25, not 5).

When used with moderate caution, however, the book will be of real service and interest to students of Arrian and of the other historians of Alexander to whom reference is frequently made. To copious citations of former workers in the field, Professor Kornemann has added his own contributions and has produced a clearly written, well-documented, even if too positive, work.

HAROLD B. DUNKEL

University of Chicago

Plotin et l'occident. By PAUL HENRY, S. J. Louvain: "Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense" Bureaux, 1934. Pp. 291. 18 belgas.

The extent of Plotinus' influence on Latin writers of the fourth and fifth centuries is examined from a literary standpoint by study of citations and allusions in Firmicus Maternus, Marius Victorinus, Augustine, Macrobius, and others. The recension of Porphyry of the *Enneades* seems to have been the edition used by Western writers, and the medieval texts as they stand are generally favored as against modern critics (notably the manuscript reading *ékeívov* in v. 2. 1-2, which all modern editors emend). Valuable tables of rejected emendations, citations in Latin authors, and Latin equivalents of many of Plotinus' Greek terms are given. The sidelights thrown upon the methods of Latin authors in quoting from Greek sources are of interest in evaluating excerpts of works no longer extant.

Macrobius is vindicated as a commentator in his own right and not just a compiler. He seems to have known the writings of Plotinus directly as well as through the medium of Porphyry. The discussion of the relation of Augustine to Plotinus is perhaps the author's best contribution. The "certain books of the Platonists" (*Conf.* viii. 2. 3) which Augustine claims to have read prior to his conversion, are proved conclusively to have been treatises of Plotinus, including most probably i. 6, v. 1 and 6. The *Enneades* freed Augustine from Manicheism, though the author denies that he ever became a Neo-Platonist, but argues that he always read Plotinus through the spectacles of the Christian Scriptures. Augustine is considered to have been too modest about his ability in Greek, and the author contends that he probably read the *Enneades* in the original as well as in Victorinus' translations of some of the treatises.

Apropos of a lengthy discussion of the manuscript variant *Plotini-Platoni* in Augustine *De beata vita* i. 4, it is somewhat amusing to find the author make a similar confusion on page 125, note 1, where he reads "Plotin" but obviously means "Platon."

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

University of Chicago

Michaelis Pselli scripta minora, Vol. I: *Orationes et dissertationes*. Magnam partem adhuc inedita edidit recognovitque EDUARDUS KURTZ ex schedis ejus relictis in lucem emisit FRANCISCUS DREXL. Milano: Società editrice "Vita e pensiero," 1936. (Orbis Romanus: Biblioteca di testi medievali.) Pp. xix+513. 8°.

When, in 1874, C. Sathas published the *Chronography* or historical memoirs of Michael Psellus covering the years from 976 to 1077, he made a true revelation concerning the history of Byzantium. This period was formerly poorly presented and little known because of scanty data of Byzantine chronicles; but with Sathas' edition, it became one of the most colorful and vivid periods of Byzantine history. Psellus was highly educated, familiar with ancient Greek civilization, of encyclopedic knowledge; he was a monk for a short time. As an active politician, closely connected with the court, and finally as prime minister, Psellus, during his service under nine emperors, steadily rose in rank and grew in influence. His literary achievement is extremely various and abundant: funeral orations, eulogies, numerous letters (about 500), the *Chronography*, and countless smaller writings on all possible subjects. The total of his literary productivity is so enormous that some scholars have explained it by assuming two or three men of the same name. The best and most recent list of Psellus' writings is to be found in E. Renaud, *Etude de la langue et du style de Michel Psellos* (Paris, 1920), pp. ix-xvii.

The material for the book under consideration, *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora*, was prepared by the eminent Byzantine scholar Ed. Kurtz, who died at Riga (now in Latvia), in 1925. For a number of years he worked strenuously, collecting all possible manuscript material by Psellus. Kurtz died before completing his work, and his daughter transmitted her father's material for final publication to the well-known German Byzantine philologist Fr. Drexl. Drexl studied the material very carefully, in many cases again consulting original manuscript codices; he made some corrections in Kurtz's text, inserted additional notes, and compiled indexes. On pages vii-xiv of his Prolegomena, Drexl gives a list of his corrections. On page xix we have a list of the ten codices which were used by Kurtz, most of them preserved in Italian libraries, especially in the Vatican.

The book contains fifty-two minor writings of Psellus, thirty-four orations, and eighteen dissertations or discussions. The orations are addressed to persons of varying rank and social position. We have one oration to the Empress Theodora (1042 and 1055-56); two to the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus (1042-55), of which the second covers twenty-one pages; two to the Emperor Michael VII Ducas (1071-78); one oration in verse to the Emperor Isaac I Comnenus (1057-59); several to various officials; an oration on the death of Sclerena, the well-known mistress of Constantine Monomachus; a very interesting encomium or eulogy on the famous compiler of lives of saints,

Simeon Metaphrastes, and a church service in his memory; a very lengthy address to the Synod on the Patriarch Michael Cerularius (pp. 232-328), etc. Among the orations occurs a *chrysobul* of the Emperor Michael VII Ducas to Robert, the Duke of Apulia, as well as several *silentia* (*selentia*), as were called the public imperial speeches which were delivered by the emperors in the palace, especially at the beginning of Lent. The eighteen dissertations or discussions deal with religious and philosophical questions.

As the title of the book indicates, most of the writings have not previously been published. To be exact, seventeen only of the fifty-two have already been issued, leaving thirty-five which appear in print for the first time.

As far as I may judge from a survey of the Greek text of the book, it is very well established on the basis of careful study of many manuscripts; from a technical standpoint it is printed excellently. The accurate work and philological knowledge of the late E. Kurtz and of Fr. Drexel are a solid guaranty of scholarly achievement.

Five indexes are added to the book (pp. 473-507): *Loci laudati*, *Index nominum*, *Index verborum potiorum*, *Index dignitatum et officiorum*, and *Index grammaticus*; these indexes, of course, considerably facilitate the use of the book and increase its value. Finally, on pages 508-13 some addenda and corrigenda are appended.

A second volume is in preparation which will contain Psellus' letters—a valuable collection.

The publication of all of Psellus' work would be of extreme importance not only for the history of Byzantium and Byzantine civilization but also for our better understanding of the so-called Italian Renaissance, where Byzantine influence was much stronger and more vital than is generally admitted.

We owe much gratitude to Professor Drexel, who not only made accessible to us Kurtz's manuscript legacy but also by his vast philological knowledge and experience added to its value.

A. VASILIEV

Madison, Wisconsin

A History of the Greek World from 479 to 323 B.C. By M. L. W. LAISTNER.
London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1936. Pp. xv+492. 15s. net.

This volume is the second in chronological sequence, and the fifth in order of publication, of the seven-volume history of the Greek and Roman world which is now appearing under the editorship of Dr. Cary, of the University of London. The greater part of the book is devoted to an account of the diplomatic and military history of the period between the end of the Persian Wars and the death of Alexander, but several chapters at the end discuss various phases of the culture of the time: the art of war, government, economics, art, literature, science, philosophy, and religion. The author's style is sober, and he shows a thorough familiarity with both the ancient sources and the most modern literature on the subjects under discussion.

This volume, like the others in the series to which it belongs, is obviously intended not as a monograph presenting new materials or views to specialists but as a popular account for the general reader or the student who is just beginning his advanced studies. Such a book, if the author's scholarship is adequate (as is certainly the case in the present instance), is to be judged largely by the choice and arrangement of materials—even though criticisms on this score necessarily reduce themselves to simple wishes that the author had written another book instead of the one he actually wrote. The choice of materials for the present volume indicates that the author holds pretty closely to the view of Thucydides and Freeman that "history is past politics." Those parts of the book which deal with politics are very full; those dealing with other matters are brief and perfunctory. It seems a pity that one hundred pages should be devoted to the details of the Peloponnesian War, while Plato is given only three. Moreover, when an author writes first of all about *haute politique*, and discusses other matters seemingly as an afterthought, he inevitably creates the impression that the statesmen in charge of this high policy were not much affected by the life about them; thus Laistner's pages tend to suggest that Greek statesmen were actuated largely by that disinterested and abstract patriotism and general well-wishing toward all men which nineteenth-century politicians ordinarily attributed to themselves when they came to write their memoirs. Likewise, there is no attempt to associate Plato's thinking with the life of his times—and least of all with the war which is discussed at such length and during which he grew to maturity. Nor is there an indication, in the three pages devoted to the Athenian dramatists, that any of these men knew what was going on in the world about them, or that their ideas made any difference to that world. Apparently, statesmen, literary men, and philosophers each operated *in vacuo*. An interesting paragraph in the Preface points out that "the standard of living was generally low in Greece," that the age under discussion "was characterized not a little by cruelty and barbarism," and that "the treatment of large sections of the slave population, the butchery and enslavement often attendant upon the capture of cities in time of war, and the practice of infanticide, which contrary to a commonly held belief was by no means confined to Sparta, bear eloquent testimony to a repulsive side of Hellenic history." But in the text itself there is surprisingly little to contradict the "Grotesque" view of Athenian perfection.

J. W. SWAIN

University of Illinois

Arte e civiltà della Sicilia antica, Vol. I: *I fattori etnici e sociali*. By BIAGIO PACE. Milano-Genova-Roma-Napoli: Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1935-XIV. Pp. xvi+503.

Of Professor Pace's qualifications for undertaking these studies on the ethnic and social history of ancient Sicily there can be no doubt. His "Arte

ed artisti della Sicilia antica" (*Memorie Lincei*, 1915) and his other numerous monographs, e.g., *Camarina, topografia, storia, archeologia* (Catania: Tirelli, 1927), are proofs of his intimate acquaintance with the field that he has long and lovingly cultivated. The present volume reattests his immense industry. One admires the author's profound knowledge of the material he works with, but one is at times disturbed by a certain superficiality of method in building up his evidence and not always able to follow him in his conclusions.

The volume opens with a masterly survey of the immense bibliography that has grown up on the subject of ancient Sicily since the Renaissance. Holm's influence is apparent, but Pace has explored this field with greater thoroughness and understanding, and he, of course, includes in his account the results that were not available when Holm published (1870) the first volume of his *Geschichte Siciliens*.

Scarcely less impressive is the synthesis of the great mass of archeological data concerning the pre-Greek populations of the island that have been gathered during the last fifty years. The successful systematization of Sicilian prehistory by Corrado and Ippolito Cafici (*Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, XII, 188 ff.) has inspired Pace to extend it, and with magnificent results, to the early historical period. Upon the Thucydidean tradition that the Sicani were the oldest inhabitants of Sicily, that the Siculi were Italic invaders from the peninsula, and that the Himera River was the dividing-line between the two groups, Pace grafts the newer evidence from archeology and glottology. His conclusion is that the Sicani were a Mediterranean people (neolithic, Eurafrie, dolichocephalic), and the Siculi a wave of Aryans kin to the Latins, Sergi's Eurasies (aeneolithic and brachycephalic). The problem whether they were originally Mediterraneans who from Sicily migrated to Italy and came back to the island after having become Aryanized in the peninsula as a result of contact with the Italics is left unsolved.

Before Italian scholars began, under the impulse of fascism, their super-nationalistic revaluation of the history of ancient Italy, Pace had, in "Arte ed artisti," formulated the thesis that Greek art in Sicily had an individuality of its own, a Sicilian stamp. To be sure, he was not a prophet crying in the wilderness, for Ettore Bignone, for one, was advocating a similar idea (*Empedocle, studio critico, traduzione e commenti delle testimonianze e dei frammenti* [Torino: Bocca, 1916]). More recently, Ciaceri's investigations on both Sicilian Hellenism and the related culture of Magna Graecia and Marconi's studies on Siceliot art have brought aid and comfort to the nationalistic revaluation. With such brilliant support Pace now takes up the cudgels in earnest against the orthodox theory, espoused, it is worth noting, even by the great Orsi, that Sicily never developed a cultural school of its own nor created an autonomous art. According to him, the indigenous characteristics of the pre-Hellenic people lived on and perpetuated themselves under Greek forms. Greek media—language, art, culture—were placed at the service of the Siculan spirit. And since the Siculi were an Italic or at least an Italicized

people (strengthened in the fourth century B.C. by the immigration of new Italic groups), it was really an Italic spirit that gave expression to Greek art in the island. If this reviewer understands it right, the problem is not the Hellenization of the Siculi, but the Siculization of the Hellenes. Influenced by the Siculan environment, the Siceliot genius from Empedocles and Stesichorus to Archimedes and Theocritus developed along lines that were really Italian, and Siceliot history moved on from Gelon to Dionysius and Agathocles to find its fulfilment in Rome (pp. x and 240-68). The alleged Romanization of the island so ripe as to call for Antony's *Lex Julia de Siculis* (p. 300), Sicily's contribution of five popes to the See of Peter (p. 325), and the ten thousand young men who joined the Mille of Garibaldi (p. 326) are all manifestations of the same urge from the ethnic Italic base of the island's population. The things Pace sees were not seen before because, in his own words, the historical criticism of the last hundred years, viewing history between the two fires of Hellenism and German romanticism, was biased against Latin and Italian civilization.

It is pertinent to note from the Preface that Professor Pace has entered public life because it seemed to him that to withdraw into the shell of research was like the play of children while the house is on fire. He definitely sets himself aside from the *studiosi apolitici*. This is, then, the author's aim, his frame of reference, and the climate in which *Arte e civiltà della Sicilia antica* has grown. Even so, much of what he proposes will probably be found true. It is not so much his thesis as his unmitigated habit of claiming everything in sight and his furious emphasis that will make this work controversial abroad. But we owe it to Professor Pace to suspend judgment until he has told his whole story in the second volume. This will not, of course, prevent American readers from smiling at the observations (pp. 268-70) with which the author, innocent of all knowledge of American history, illustrates his thesis.

This reviewer is disappointed with most of Book II, "Economic and Social Life." Let it be understood that the part dealing with the civil organization and the economic activity of the natives has been very well done. The rest, as well as an earlier chapter on "Rome and Sicily," is a mere restatement of the known body of information and misinformation and bears, moreover, the evidence of careless scholarship. Let two or three examples among many suffice. Livy's sixty cities which in the beginning of the First Punic War went over to the Romans are here (p. 272) still regarded as cities (the uninformed reader will, of course, think of city-states) rather than villages. On page 285 the number of cities in the early Roman period is put at sixty-eight besides Lipara, but on page 304 Lipara is counted among these sixty-eight cities. The vexing problem of the pastoral economy preceding the Servile Wars gets one sentence only (p. 387), and as authority Pace cites the study of an obscure writer under the date 1855. No attempt is made to define any particular period in the discussion of industry and trade. Greek authorities of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. and Roman writers of the Republic and the Empire are

thrown indiscriminately together to prove that Sicily produced horses or sheep or wine, as if these industries did not change in seven hundred years.

Despite these faults, and there are many more, the excellent portions already indicated will mark this work as a milestone in the studies of ancient Sicily. Like the histories by Freeman and Holm, *Arte e civiltà* will be indispensable. Let us trust, then, that an index will be provided in the second volume. We are grateful to the author and the publishers for the wealth of illustrations and the extremely informative maps. The publishers must be congratulated for the beauty of the edition.

VINCENT SCRAMUZZA

Smith College

Five Men: Character Studies from the Roman Empire. By MARTIN PERCIVAL CHARLESWORTH. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936. \$2.00.

This is the sixth volume of the Martin Classical Lectures, which are given annually at Oberlin College. The subjects treated in the book are "The Native Ruler (Agrippa I)," "The Philosopher (Musonius Rufus)," "The Adventurer (Josephus)," "The Administrator (Agricola)," and "The Merchant," which unlike the others does not deal with an individual but is a composite picture.

The author has an interesting style and gives his readers a vivid picture of the persons whom he describes and analyzes. Suggestive comments are interspersed among the factual material, as on page 51, where he notes the rarity of theory or practice of social service in antiquity; page 88, where he points out our indebtedness to Josephus for the information he gives us on social, religious, political, and even military questions; and pages 89-91, where he discusses Josephus' two references to Jesus. Certainly, most readers will agree with him in his rejection of the Burkitt-Laquerre theory that the references to Christ were inserted later by Josephus in order to revive the decreasing circulation of *The Jewish Antiquities!*

In other cases, however, Professor Charlesworth's suggestions are not so plausible. For instance, when he intimates (p. 24) that Agrippa may have planned to establish worship of himself as a god, he goes far beyond any evidence adduced either by himself or by anyone else. The whole trend of his own analysis of Agrippa's character is against such a supposition. And his hint (p. 29) that, if Agrippa had lived, the siege of Jerusalem, the destruction of the Temple, and the final dispersion of the Jews might not have happened, obviously belongs to the vaguest of all categories, "the might have beens" of history. The interpenetration of the Welsh language by words of Latin origin (pp. 125-28) is interesting and even striking but has no special relevance to Agricola's career as administrator in Britain. It is part of the whole story of Roman domination in Britain, and it would be difficult to determine how

much of it should be assigned to Agricola's occupation of the country. The passage indeed illustrates a tendency to digression, a still more notable example of which appears on pages 144-45, where the information afforded by epitaphs in regard to the life of the humbler members of society is treated at some length. This is in the lecture on "The Merchant," and its connection with the subject is somewhat tenuous. What the author says is interesting, but it is not specially apposite.

The book is well edited and printed. I have noted only one typographical error: Domita *for* Domitia on page 102.

GORDON J. LAING

University of Chicago

Roman Alpine Routes. By WALTER WOODBURN HYDE ("Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society," Vol. II). Philadelphia, 1935. Pp. xiii+248. \$3.00.

Dr. Hyde has offered in this work a concise and readable account of the various routes across the Alps that were used by the Romans. This story, to quote his own words, "has never yet been adequately told to English readers." After a short account of the Alps in Roman times and after, the routes themselves are treated in geographical order, one chapter being devoted to the western Alps, one to the central Alps, and two to the eastern Alps. The work closes with a short excursus on Hannibal's Pass.

It is perhaps perfectly fair to say that Dr. Hyde has tried less to be original than to summarize the works of others, adding comments from his own extensive firsthand knowledge of the passes themselves. Thus the two chapters on the eastern Alps are largely based (p. 117) on Cartellieri, *Die roemischen Alpenstrassen ueber den Brenner Reschen-Scheideck und Ploeckenpass*, a work to which indeed it would seem difficult to add much of importance.

A few errors were noted. On page 70, as an example, the year 1125 is said to be "a few years before" the year 1081. The work is well arranged and will serve a useful purpose.

L. C. WEST

Washington, D.C.

Probleme der fruhgriechischen Plastik. By ALOIS GOTSMICH. Prague: Czerny, 1935. Pp. 121 with 6 figures.

This book is one of a number of recent studies on the dim beginnings of Greek sculpture. Gotsmich's conclusion, broadly stated, is that oriental influence is slight and archaic Greek art is essentially a natural growth from Geometric art. Thus he is more or less definitely opposed to V. Müller, in whose extensive study (*Frühe Plastik in Griechenland und Vorderasien*) strong oriental influence was found and analyzed (see Müller's review, *AJA*, 1936, p. 277). The question is rather intangible, since it is impossible to deny the

existence of oriental influences, and their evaluation and formulation must be largely subjective. Gotsmich's discussion, with its own emphases, contributes to an understanding of the factors in the situation. Among the sculptures receiving special consideration is the painful standing goddess in Berlin; the author holds out no hope that it is modern but concludes that it was made soon after 570 in a deliberately archaizing style.

In his last thirty pages Gotsmich argues that no quotation marks are necessary in writing of the "Nike of Archermos." After pointing out that there would be a good case for the attribution on literary evidence alone, he studies at great length the likelihood of a connection between the statue and the signed base. The reader will decide that the connection is not impossible, as has usually been thought since Sauer's article of 1891, but he will hardly be convinced that it is very probable. Then the author maintains that, although as usually seen the statue does not exemplify East Greek style, it does so when seen from below, in its original aspect. This appears to involve the difficult assumption that that style was a matter of deliberate intent and that statues were designed to show it from certain viewpoints. In fact, what is known of East Greek style is of virtually no value for an individual like Archermos. The weathering of the Nike, if correctly described, would seem to exclude the possibility that it was an akroterion, and I note that there is no mention of this hypothesis in the official publication of the old temple at Delos (*Délos*, XII, 215). It seems likely that the Nike was in a partly sheltered situation, perhaps within the colonnade of a temple, on a pedestal of some height. Its base may well have borne a signature of Archermos, but one cannot feel sure that it is the existing base.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

Profiles of Greek Mouldings. By LUCY T. SHOE. Published for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Harvard University Press, 1936. One volume text, 188 pp.; portfolio of 85 plates. \$10.

This work has an imposing appearance; the plates measure about 21 by 15 inches, and the volume of text is the same size as the portfolio. The content is imposing also. "The scope of the material studied includes all the stone mouldings of major Greek architecture from the earliest examples in the late 7th or early 6th century B.C. down to the end of the 2nd century B.C." Geographically there is a regrettable limitation: the moldings of Italy and Sicily are not included. Except to avoid delay, it is emphatically *not* "best to treat them separately later." It is to be hoped that nothing will prevent Miss Shoe from completing this later treatment. In the meantime, we have a great deal.

The drawings were made with the use of the template, an appliance that permits mechanical accuracy. For undercuts, where the template could not be used, a flexible lead wire yielded similar results. The profiles are repro-

duced full size, as they should be. There are six plates containing eighty photographic illustrations of moldings, as seen from the front. Though these are little noticeable in comparison with the great stock of drawings, they are most acceptable, and more would have been welcome; Miss Shoe takes rather too cheerful a view of the existing state of knowledge "concerning mouldings in their two-dimensional character."

Plates I-XXIV contain ovolos; XXV-XXXIX, cyma reversas; XL-XLIX, cyma rectas; L-LXI, hawksbeaks; LXII-LXIII, cavettos; LXIV-LXXI, half-rounds; LXXI-LXXII, scotias; LXXIII-LXXIV, Doric geison drips. Each plate contains several drawings, sometimes as many as seventy-five. If this quantity of reliable material were accompanied only by identifying tables, the publication would be well worth while. The text does consist largely of tables, but they contain a great deal more than identification. In Part II of the text architectural members are treated as such: simas, geison crowns, and fifteen other categories. In both moldings and members the historical development is traced. For each building a more or less precise date is given. As would be expected, the chronological evidence of the moldings is clearer in some cases than in others, and probably Miss Shoe's dates vary also in independence. When the moldings clearly militate against a certain date, she states the fact; it seems to be her practice in other cases to accept a date already given, without much comment to show whether the moldings confirm it or merely do not definitely contradict it. It is often not clear whether she is even aware of divergent opinions on chronology; the numerous references are primarily to illustrations, and many important discussions are not mentioned. Often a glance at the plate, where a molding appears among its companions, makes the trend of its testimony clear. In general, Miss Shoe's dates are not startling: the Theseum is dated 450-440, the temple at Tegea 360, the temple at Nemea 330. The Bassai temple, more debatable, is placed at *ca.* 420, the Nereid Monument 420-400. The moldings of the South Stoa at Corinth indicate a date in the fourth century rather than in the late third as proposed by Broneer. Those of the parodos gate at Epidaurus support Fiechter's fourth-century date as opposed to Bulle's in the second century. Miss Shoe evidently found no evidence of two periods in the temple at Priene (cf. Schede, *Jb. Arch. I.*, XLIX [1934], 97-108).

I have noted a few misprints and small disfigurements; the worst is "infer" for "imply"; do they really talk that way at Bryn Mawr? In the tables the opportunity for error is infinite, but the errors are probably few, for the author's work is evidently as careful as laborious. By her work she has transformed one of the most obscure fields in Greek archeology into one of the most fully revealed. The book is indispensable to serious students of Greek architecture.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

Herbarius: Recherches sur le cérémonial usité chez les anciens pour la cueillette des simples et des plantes magiques. By A. DELATTE. ("Collection d'Etudes Anciennes, Publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.") Paris: Société d'Edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1936. Pp. 126. (This work may be found in monograph form in the publications of the Académie royale de Belgique, *Bulletin de la classe des lettres*, 5th ser., Vol. XXXIII, Nos. 6-9.)

The present century has witnessed a remarkable growth of interest in folklore the world over. Since a wealth of material for fundamental studies in European folklore is preserved in Greek and Latin sources, it is peculiarly gratifying that more classical scholars are now ransacking them. A great many ancient superstitions survive in writers who made contributions to the literature of power, as contrasted by De Quincey with the literature of knowledge; for this reason a knowledge of folklore is sometimes essential to complete literary appreciation. I have seen in translations of classical authors a number of errors due to unfamiliarity with folklore.

We have long needed special studies of what might be called the ritual of wonder-working. Delatte's *Herbarius* will help to meet this need. It has to do with many ceremonies used in popular medicine of the kind which originated among *agrestes litterarumque ignari*, to use Pliny the Elder's expression (xxv. 16). Since many of the prescriptions he mentions are presumably far older than the knowledge of writing in Europe, it is doubtful whether one could find a more logical subject with which to begin the study of magical methods.

Delatte systematizes the forms and ceremonies used in plucking simples and magical plants. The herbalist might have to use one hand or the other, face east or west, be clothed in a certain way or be entirely nude, and use instruments made of specified metals. He had to do his gathering at certain times of the day or the night or the year and under favorable conditions of the moon. He might find it necessary to use apologies, prayers, entreaties, or imprecations. Some requirements were simple and easily met. Others were complex and demanded considerable skill, as we may see from the measures which Medea took in order to aid Jason (Ovid *Met.* vii. 179-236).

The reasons for many usages and ceremonies are discussed by Delatte. As a rule, an author who assumes the task of explaining a number of folk customs advances two or three theories which are fanciful or forced. Delatte's are plausible and attractive. He is familiar with a wide range of bibliography, so that his conclusions are never hasty. He has done an excellent piece of work.

Such investigations have great incidental value. For instance, a not infrequent custom of naming the sick person for whom a plant was being gathered (pp. 67-68), a procedure which definitely allocates the benefit to be derived from the plant, makes it perfectly clear why Tiberius insisted upon being addressed by name when anyone wished him health as he sneezed (Pliny *Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 23).

If plants were to perform their magical mission effectively, they had to yield themselves to the picker unreluctantly and with good grace (p. 51). From this prerequisite to successful treatment we can understand much better the reason for the joy of the conquerors of Veii when Juno nodded assent to the question: *Visne Romam ire, Iuno* (Livy v. 22. 5)? Livy himself seems not to have understood the purport of the question, for he attributed it either to divine inspiration or to a young man's sense of humor, but the folklore which he preserves (v. 22. 6) about the incident dwells on the ease with which the goddess was transported to Rome and enables us to see that acquiescence and compliance were essential to the receipt of benefits from plants and goddess alike: "Inde fabulae adiectum est vocem quoque dicentis velle auditam; motam certe sede sua parvi molimenti adminiculis, sequentis modo accepimus levem ac facilem tralatu fuisse integrumque in Aventinum, aeternam sedem suam . . . perlatam. . . ." Obviously reluctance and mental reservations hindered or nullified accomplishment as readily as physical impediments, such as a girdle or hair tied in a knot. Other examples of the incidental uses to which this book might be put could readily be given.

Like pagan religious ritual and ceremonies, the methods of gathering herbs and plants were modified by Christianity, whose priests endeavored to give them a religious aspect or interpretation (pp. 82-86, 119-20). Doubtless it was because of Christian influence that many of the forms of the ancient herbalist have died out. I find comparatively few contemporary analogues to ancient methods of picking plants to be used in popular medicine. A reasonably close parallel has been collected in Kentucky: "You may cure cancer by going at daybreak to an apple tree on three successive mornings and pronouncing a certain imprecation." The reader will recall that there were among the ingredients of the "charm of powerful trouble" brewed by the witches in *Macbeth* "root of hemlock digg'd i' the dark" and "slips of yew sliver'd in the moon's eclipse." Other modern examples may be found in a chapter called "Plants in Folk-Medicine" in T. F. Thiselton-Dyer's *Folk-Lore of Plants* (London, 1889).

I could add a few pertinent classical references, but in view of the large number of papyri and codices that the author consulted in widely scattered cities of Europe such an act would be invidious.

Delatte's subject matter is well organized, but the book would be far more convenient for the reader if it had an occasional heading. It is divided into sections by blank lines, which are restful but not informative. It contains neither a table of contents nor a subject index.

The favorable reception which Delatte's book will undoubtedly receive should encourage him to continue his studies of the methods of wonder-workers in general. Investigation of the ceremonies employed in making use of animals or parts of animals would yield results equally valuable.

EUGENE S. McCARTNEY

University of Michigan

Der Vegetarismus in der Antike. By JOHANNES HAUSLEITER. ("Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten," Band XXIV.) Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1935. Pp. viii+427. Rm. 22.50.

Like other volumes in this series, this is an exhaustive and excellent study. It is saved from the limited range of interest suggested by the title by the author's sound method of presenting the problem of vegetarianism in ancient culture as an illuminating illustration of divergent world-views and philosophies of life. The conclusions are judicious, if not new. The Orphic movement, coming from Thrace, was the initiator of vegetarianism in the Greek world. Rohde's interpretation is in the main followed. From the Orphics the Pythagoreans took the idea. Haussleiter follows Strathmann in viewing both early and neo-Pythagorean asceticism as motivated primarily by interest in prophecy and divination, and only secondarily because of belief in metempsychosis. Later philosophic schools or individuals were all influenced either positively or negatively toward vegetarianism as a result of Pythagorean teaching, though acceptance of it was grounded upon rationalistic or moral or hygienic reasons, seldom upon the religious motives of the Pythagoreans. Generally speaking, two fundamentally opposed viewpoints were current. One, represented by men like Empedocles or Theophrastos, tended to look upon all life, whether human or animal (and sometimes even plant), as kin, and postulated a golden age in the past when all living things were at peace with one another. The other, which goes back to the Sophists, dismissed the golden age of the past for an evolutionary view of human culture and recognition of the food quest as a fundamental culture-making factor. These, of course, looked upon all the world as made for the use and enjoyment of man.

The author builds a solid chronological survey of ancient writers who dealt with the subject. Many of them, to be sure, are preserved only in Porphyry. In the critique of this capital source Haussleiter follows the lead of Bernays' work on Theophrastos. An appendix contains a discussion of vegetarianism in ancient medicine.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

University of Chicago

Wilhelm Meyer aus Speyer und Paul von Winterfeld. By KARL LANGOSCH. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1936. Pp. 126 with 2 photographs. Rm. 2.50.

An air of melancholy pervades this work. To be sure, Langosch is proud because "in these inspiring times, in which our German people, under the leadership of Adolf Hitler, is building its Third Reich, we feel more strongly than ever the rejuvenating and energizing force we can create out of our ancient national culture"; but only a few lines later he has sadly to admit that the chair of medieval Latin literature dignified by Meyer at Göttingen, lapsed at his death in 1917, while that at Berlin established for Winterfeld

was abandoned in 1931 on the death of his successor, Karl Strecker, to give place to one in general philology. It is no part of Langosch's task to point out that the study of medieval Latin literature is vigorously pursued in other countries than the Third Reich. In his fervent admiration of his two idols he goes so far as to say (p. 7) that Meyer and Winterfeld advanced medieval Latin studies more than Traube; but in one vital respect they were vastly his inferiors. Meyer, as he notes on page 18, had no talent for attracting pupils; Winterfeld was an invalid recluse, happiest when alone with his books and somewhat daunted when he found forty students present at a lecture. Traube's unsurpassed gift for friendship, his vivifying genius as a teacher, his total lack of any nationalistic prejudices such as disfigure most European scholarship today—these personal qualities, and the afflux of numerous American students, resulted in a westward current of inspiration, which makes our own country today, more than any other, the center of research in the Latin language and literature of the Middle Ages.

Nonetheless, we are grateful to Langosch for this tribute to the memory of two great scholars in this field. Wilhelm Meyer aus Speyer (1845-1917) spent most of his life's energies on the libraries of Munich and Göttingen; his career as a medieval Latinist grew out of those activities. Splendidly trained in the classics under Karl Halm, he became Halm's assistant in cataloguing the Munich manuscripts, and before he finished, ten years later, he had described over ten thousand of them. He was continually finding unknown treasures among them; his interests grew with his learning, and his 111 published titles deal with topics as diverse as Greek proverbs, rhymed hexameters, Lutwin's *Adam und Eva*, Melanchthon's letters to Camerarius, Luther's sermons, the *Reis Glorios* of the troubadour Guiraut de Borneil, Calderon's oriental sibyl, Sarmiento de Gamboa's *History of the Inca Empire of Peru*, and ancient carving on ivory. But medieval Latin became his forte; his name will always be associated with the Carmina Burana, the Waltharius, Ruodlieb, the Ludus de Anticristo; and his great merit was in his original contributions to the knowledge of late Latin and Greek rhythm, particularly in prose, where he led the way.

Paul von Winterfeld was born a generation later, in 1872, grew up an invalid, and died, when only thirty-three, in 1905, two years before his older friend and collaborator, Traube. I enjoyed the same privilege he had, of working in Continental libraries over Latin manuscripts under Traube's direction; Winterfeld records that in St. Gall he worked thirteen and a half hours a day, and Traube's letters to him, begging him to be more reasonable, sound very familiar. Winterfeld had the best of training in the classics, under Vahlen and Kirchhoff. A poet by nature, he devoted himself to Hrotsvitha, and edited (in part with Traube) a considerable share of the Latin Merovingian and Caroline poets for the *Monumenta Germaniae*. At his death he left, almost ready to publish, a volume of poems, among them translations of the episode of Waltharius and Hildegund, and of Ruodlieb. This was brought out in 1913

by his friend, H. Reich. But, alas, death took him when he had not yet filled out the first year of his Berlin professorship. We who were Traube's pupils can testify to Traube's grief over the untimely fate of his friend and pupil—to be so soon succeeded by our own grief over the death of Traube himself, the closest friend and the most inspiring teacher any of us has ever known.

Langsch has contributed a useful and interesting retrospect, of value to all who occupy themselves with medieval literature; his bibliographies are exhaustive. The booklet is easy to read and almost without misprints. It is pleasant to learn that Weidmann is bringing out the long delayed third volume of Wilhelm Meyer's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rhythmis*, edited by Edward Schröder.

C. U. CLARK

City College, New York City

The Plays of Euripides. Done into English by MOSES HADAS and JOHN HARVEY MCLEAN. New York: Dial Press, 1936. Pp. 499. \$2.75.

De gustibus non disputandum is a maxim that holds peculiarly true of translations from Greek poetry. In their Preface the authors quote from Professor Gilbert Murray's *Euripides and His Age*: "A good prose translation, which should really bring out the full meaning of the Greek, is greatly needed" and announce their purpose of endeavoring to supply this need. But a prose translation need not necessarily be prosaic, not to say prosy, and I do not fear that I shall stand alone in feeling that the translators have not often risen above the dead level. In their first sentence they say that "the best that a translation of a poetic work can offer is a glimpse of the original as through a glass darkly."

In format the present volume, though it contains only half of Euripides' plays, is 9½ by 6½ by 2 inches and weighs 36 ounces. It is awkward to hold and soon tires the hand. One could scarcely read it very long except flat on a desk or by using a bookrest. Any student would balk at carrying it between his home and the classroom together with the usual assortment of books for other classes. The brevity of the introduction to each play and the complete lack of notes, moreover, will prevent the translation's being used independently of a teacher or a manual. It was a happy thought to set off the lyric passages by printing them in italics. A curious feature of the typography is seen in the fact that the introductory pages are numbered with Roman numerals (i–xvi), which are continued with Arabic (17–499).

We are promised a second volume which will contain the other plays and an extended essay on Euripides. From the Introduction to the present volume I judge that this essay will lean heavily upon A. W. Verrall and Gilbert Murray, whose ideas, brilliant as they often are, should be adopted with caution.

ROY C. FLICKINGER

University of Iowa

The Alcestis of Euripides: An English Version. By DUDLEY FITTS and ROBERT FITZGERALD. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1936. Pp. 91. \$1.25.

A good verse translation must be considered on its own merits as English poetry; it must be convincing and clear as well as reasonably faithful to the original. These requirements are, on the whole, satisfactorily met by this translation, written with the needs of the modern stage in view. Avoiding the ornate dulness or the Victorian sweetness of certain translations, the translators have written a simply phrased poetic drama in modern idiom, keeping all the poignant pathos of the Greek.

Their refreshing attempt to abjure the customary high-flown verbiage has not prevented them from falling into an undue brevity (ll. 199–200, 215–16) and harshness which fail at times to reproduce the really colorful Greek; in other instances they have been forced to embroider the original, as at lines 703–5. "Old Wheeleyes" is excellent for *Κύκλωπας* (l. 6), but *θάρσει* (l. 38) comes out as "You need not be afraid of me, Death." *ναυκληρίαν* (l. 112), "power," *πύργον μέγαν* (l. 311) "strong friend," *κηλήσαντά* (l. 359) "call you back," *ἀνηλίους* (l. 852) "sad," are colorless indeed. A misleading effect is given to lines 48, 384, while 334–35 and 893–94 are quite mistranslated. "Do you think this attitude of yours is necessary?" (l. 1091) is bad poetry as well as mistranslation. "Time is short, go, pump her full of more children!" (p. 52) is more harsh than *φυτένω* (l. 662) permits, despite the indignation of Admetus.

In addition to untranslatable exclamations, at least sixty-eight lines are omitted from the text; but it is a compliment to the good taste of the translators to say that Euripides himself should have excised them. The stasima are rendered in the same iambic pentameter as the dialogue, thus making them indistinguishable, save for marginal headings, from the rest of the play. Much stichomythia is compressed into bare phrases, without loss of meaning, although in another passage (p. 56) thirty Greek words are stretched into forty-eight English words. I fail to see the reason for making the servant speak prose and Heracles free verse in their well-known conversation, for all the skill and wit with which it is turned into English; in the Greek, both, of course, use iambic trimeter. I doubt the effectiveness of giving line 1118 to Heracles instead of to Admetus; but the placing of 423–24 after 434 is more sensible than the original arrangement.

I should like to see the translators do the *Hippolytus* or the *Bacchae*, both greater plays than the *Alcestis*, contrary to the statement on the book jacket. It is a pity we could not also have Mr. Allan Sly's music for the play. And is it not high time young poets ceased to invoke a fillip of austere praise for their work from T. S. Eliot, on jacket blurbs or elsewhere? The merits of this translation do not stand in need of such an Olympian *imprimatur*.

LEVI ROBERT LIND

Wabash College

Procopius, VI: The Anecdota or Secret History. With an English translation by H. B. DEWING. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1935. Pp. xxii+384; 2 pls. and 2 maps.

This edition of the *Secret History*, with its plates containing portraits of Justinian and Theodora and its maps of Constantinople and of the Roman Empire at the close of Justinian's reign, is one of the more pretentious members of the Loeb series. An ample introduction sets forth the purpose and plan of the *History*, the question of its authorship, and its historical value, as well as a brief notice of previous editions and translations. The text follows, in the main, Haury's Teubner edition of 1906. The English version is quite adequate and does not seek refuge in Latin even for the account of Theodora's youth. A number of well-selected notes, many of which are unfortunately marred by misprints, accompany the translation. In addition to the usual brief *apparatus criticus*, there are an English index (mostly of proper names) and a short chronological table. The following corrections and suggestions may be noted.

The explanatory notes to the translation contain a few minor infelicities and several misprints.

- P. 17, n. 1. The mention of Photius here cited (v. 18. 18) is only incidental to the narration of the exploits of his groom. A better reference would be v. 5. 5.
- P. 53 (iv. 37). In view of the fate, either before or after birth, of the other offspring of the Empress, a note on Anastasius, referring to pp. xix ff., would be helpful.
- P. 55, n. 1. *For Book iii read Book vii.*
- P. 57, n. 1. *For Book vii. 16 read Book vii. 12. 16.*
- P. 59, n. 2. The reference here to vii. 18. 25 is patently incorrect. I am not sure, however, to which point the editor wished to refer; possibly to vi. 18. 3; *Anec.* iv. 41; or ix. 30 ff.
- P. 61, n. 2. *For Book iii read Book vii.*
- P. 63, n. 2. *For Book ii. 30. 40 read Book vii. 30. 4.*
- P. 237. In the translation, the superior numeral 1 has been misplaced. It now appears after "Prefect of the City" (already explained, p. 235, n. 1) rather than after "Praetor of the Plebs."
- P. 347, n. 2. Here "a day's journey" is made still more indefinite by being explained as "about twenty miles." It has already been defined as "about twenty-five miles" (p. 27, n. 4) and as "about twenty-four miles" (iii. i. 17). Although the measure is admittedly rough, one equation should suffice.

In the English version, although the translator has generally been careful to clear up the shift in reference of the Greek pronouns and subjects, in three cases (iv. 14-16; v. 6-8; and xii. 12-13) clarity would have been increased by the substitution of proper names. The sentence "Not in all cases . . ." (xi. 36) is clumsy in its present order. Since in most cases Mr. Dewing has not hesitated to render into English what he found in the Greek, I call him to account in two places. First, "compromised" (v. 21) is certainly understate-

ment for διαπεπαρθενευμένη. (He mends his ways in xvii. 36.) Second, οὐκ ἄτρητον (xvii. 36) must have been the source for many a Greek equivalent of our smoking-room story; hence, it is too bad that "tampered with" is chosen to represent it, particularly since the rise of philately makes the literal rendition appropriate. And one wishes that the translator had stooped to "devilish-ly" for δαιμονίως (xii. 27) thus preserving the demoniacal tone of the passage.

Granting that "it's a wise child" and that we know little about Photius' father, I feel that ὅστις (ii. 6) must, like οἵτινες (vi. 1), mean "what sort of man your father was," not "who your father was." Antonia's former marriage is mentioned several times; and Belisarius' remarks about the father's financial status are absurd if he is actually unknown. In the English I know, the two phrases are not synonymous; but the former are "fighting words."

Although Haury's explanation of ἐκπεσοῦσα (ix. 4) should not be lightly dismissed, the word here may well mean "having become a widow." In the context, may not ἔκεινη (ix. 9) better refer to Comito than to the mother? Finally, "to toss the man in the air as children do on their way to school" (xvii. 37), despite the pretty picture it calls up of youthful pranks, is simply one of those slips which apparently happen in nearly every translation.

In short, more careful proofreading would have made a more valuable book (I pass over sins of omission and commission in the punctuation of both Greek and English). Nevertheless, the book is a worthy, if somewhat negligently treated, member of the Loeb Library.

HAROLD B. DUNKEL

University of Chicago

By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism. By ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935. Pp. xv+436. \$5.00.

Professor Goodenough gives in this volume a fresh interpretation of the extant literary sources of Diaspora Judaism which merits the serious attention of students of religion and philosophy in the Hellenistic age. Briefly, his thesis is that the Jews living in a Greek environment—or at least a significant minority of them—reinterpreted their Scriptures and transformed their worship under the influence of the prevailing ideology of Gentile mystery religions. Naturally, Philo of Alexandria is the chief source; and Professor Goodenough's exposition of this important thinker through nine chapters leaves little to be desired. That Philo's mystic philosophy was not a brand-new creation or considered heretical by the Alexandrian Jews he proves without doubt. But the question still remains as to how representative Philonic Judaism was of Diaspora Judaism as a whole. The remainder of sources from Diaspora Judaism, which Goodenough discusses in one chapter, do not seem to the reviewer to give a sufficient amount of evidence one way or another.

The attempt to attach Philo's philosophy to a mystic cult seems as uncertain as in the case of the Hermeticists or of Plotinus, with whom Philo's

system has its closest parallels. For example, Moses seems much more like Hermes Trismegistus than any of the dying and rising gods of the mystery cults; and Philo's exposition of the "Mystery of Aaron" as represented in the *De specialibus legibus*, for instance, impresses the reviewer as being purely academic rather than based upon actual cultic practice. Such a symbolic interpretation was forced upon Jews outside of Palestine if the ceremonial laws of the Torah were to have any religious significance for them. Goodenough has promised to furnish more "light" on the problem of cultus in a forthcoming volume which will deal with cultic remains, and specifically with the frescoes of the Jewish synagogue recently discovered at Dura. This will be awaited with interest, for no one is more competent for this task than Professor Goodenough. Despite our disagreement with the author's principal thesis, this book is highly recommended and undoubtedly serves as the best exposition of Philo in English.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

University of Chicago

De sonis et formis titulorum Milesiorum Didymaeorumque. By BONDE BONDesson. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1936. Pp. xviii+224.

Dr. Bondesson has treated his subject exhaustively as well as with good judgment. He has mustered all the material available and gives a complete list of inscriptions and their place of publication up to the Byzantine age. He shows the same thoroughness in the analysis of his material, and both the aspects treated and the citations given on each grammatical question bear evidence to his painstaking concern to attain to the maximum possible completeness. The writer also shows good judgment in the interpretation of his material, although self-evidently no one would agree with him on every question, and some of his explanations are at least debatable. Thus he takes the question of the relation of Ionic δέκνυμι to δείκνυμι a little too lightly when he dismisses it with the statement that the two are to be referred to different roots. It is true that more than one root is probably involved, but we would like to know how it happened that the two roots became so nearly identical.

However, for a work of this kind such questions are necessarily in the background, and its greatest importance lies in its giving us a complete treatise on the sounds and inflection of the Milesian inscriptions. It is not the writer's fault that the subject matter offered no opportunity for the discovery of facts of larger importance. That Milesian was practically identical with the Ionic of the other cities of Asia Minor, that it gave way to the Attic in the same way and at the same time, was known before, and the more detailed study of a larger amount of material could only add confirmation.

WALTER PETERSEN

BOOKS RECEIVED

L'Acropole: revue du monde hellénique, X, Fasc. 3-4 (July-December, 1935), 113-75. Monaco, 1935.

BLAKE, WARREN E. (ed.). *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis de Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri octo*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Pp. xx+142. \$3.50.

BONNER, ROBERT J., and SMITH, GERTRUDE. *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, Vol. II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Pp. vii+320. \$3.50.

Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, Vol. LXI, Fasc. 1 (1937). Paris: E. de Boccard, 1937. Pp. 215+21 pls.

BUSCAROLI, CORSO. *Perfidum ridens Venus: l'ode III 27 di Orazio con versione ritmica ed esegesi*. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1937. Pp. 76. L. 10.

BUZIO, CARLO. *Esiodo nel mondo greco sino alla fine dell'età classica*. ("Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore," Ser. 4, Vol. XXVII.) Milan: "Vita e pensiero," 1938. Pp. xii+164. L. 15.

CASEY, ROBERT P., LAKE, SILVA, and LAKE, AGNES K. (eds.) *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirssopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends*. London: Christophers, 1937. Pp. viii+367.

Classica et mediaevalia: revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire, Vol. I, Fasc. 1. Copenhagen: Librairie Gyldendal, 1938.

Classical Quarterly, Vol. XXXII, No. 2 (April, 1938). London: John Murray, 1938. 4/- net.

DEBEVOISE, NEILSON C. *A Political History of Parthia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Pp. xlili+303. \$3.00.

DONNELLY, FRANCIS P., S.J. *Literature: The Leading Educator*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1938. Pp. xv+278. \$3.00.

FRYE, PROSSER HALL. *Plato*. ("University Studies," Vol. XXXVIII, Nos. 1-2.) Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska, 1938. Pp. viii+113. \$1.25.

GAGNÉR, ANDERS. *Florilegium Gallicum: Untersuchungen und Texte zur Geschichte der mittellateinischen Florilegienliteratur*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1936. Pp. 248+2 pls. Kr. 10.

HAMMER, WILLIAM. *Latin and German Encomia of Cities*. Dissertation. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1937. (Private edition, distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries.) Pp. 78.

HEINZE, RICHARD. *Vom Geist des Römertums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze herausgegeben von Erich Burck*. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1938. Pp. vi+296; geb., Rm. 7.20.

HIGHAM, T. F., and BOWRA, C. M. (eds.). *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Pp. cxii+781. \$3.00.

MADDALENA, ANTONIO. *L'Antilesi di Talete*. (Reprinted from: *Memorie della Reale Accademia di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti in Padova*, anno 1936-37 [XV], Vol. LIII.)

—. *Anassimandro e l'infinito come simultaneità*. (Reprinted from: *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti*, XCVI, Part 2 [1936-37], 683-720.)

MAHR, AUGUST C. *The Origin of the Greek Tragic Form: A Study of the Early Theater in Attica*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1938. Pp. xviii+247. \$3.00.

MANACORDAS, GUIDO. *Dante: Ein Lebensbild*. Berlin: Wessobrunner Verlag, 1938. Pp. 43.

MARKOWSKI, HIERONYMUS. *De Graeca inscriptione Nazarea*. (Odbitka z Eos, Kwartalnika Klas, 1937.) Lwów, 1937. Pp. 17.

MOORE, R. W. (ed.) *The Romans in Britain: A Selection of Latin Texts with Commentary*. London: Methuen & Co., 1938. Pp. xii+214. 6 s. net.

NEWBY, JESSIE D. *A Numismatic Commentary on the "Res Gestae" of Augustus, with Four Plates*. Iowa City, Iowa: Athens Press, 1938. Pp. xvi+117. \$3.50.

PLATNAUER, M. (ed.) *Euripides: Iphigeneia in Tauris Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Pp. xxiv+186. \$2.25.

QUINN, JOHN B. (trans.) *Horace: Odes and Art of Poetry in English Verse with Introduction and Notes*. St. Louis: Blackwell Wielandy Co., 1938. Pp. xlvi+175.

RAND, E. K. *The Mediaeval Virgil*. (Reprint from: *Studi medievali*, N.S., Vol. V [1932].) Torino: G. Chiantore.

STEVENS, GORHAM PHILLIPS. *The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. ix+78. \$2.50.

WÜST, FRITZ R. *Philip II. von Makedonien und Griechenland in den Jahren von 346 bis 338*. ("Münchener Historische Abhandlungen," 1. Reihe, 14. Heft: Allgemeine und politische Geschichte.) München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938. Pp. 189. Rm. 8; abroad, Rm. 6.

ZIELIŃSKI, THADDEUS. *Iresione, Tomus II: Dissertationes ad antiquorum reliquias spectantes continens*. ("Eus supplementa," Vol. VIII.) Leopoli: Societas philologa Polonorum, 1936.

CORRIGENDUM

Class. Phil., XXXIII, 236, next to the last line of the second paragraph,
for medieval read medical.

